

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of the United Irish Societies of Chicago, Ill., favoring freedom for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition of voters of Kirkwood, Ill., for the passage of proper legislation prohibiting the use of all food products in the manufacture of alcoholic beverages for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Gerlaw United Presbyterian Church, Gerlaw, Ill., requesting the passage of legislation to prohibit the manufacture of foodstuffs into beer and other alcoholic liquors, and making the Nation bone-dry during the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of West Side United Presbyterian congregation, of Monmouth, Ill., requesting legislation to prohibit the use of foodstuffs for the manufacture of beer and other alcoholic liquors, and making the Nation bone-dry during the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition for a repeal of the zone rate for second-class mail matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Resolution of Rhode Island House of Representatives, favoring a league of nations to safeguard the peace of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NOLAN: Petitions of County Clare Association of California, by R. Barry, secretary; John McBryde Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, by M. Gaul, president; Ladies' Auxiliary to the Connaught Social and Benevolent Association, by Mary M. Roddy, secretary, favoring Rankin resolution No. 204, for Irish independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Division No. 2, Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, by J. J. Leveney, secretary; Division No. 10, Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, by M. J. Giles, secretary; Division No. 12, Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, by P. J. Mahoney, secretary, favoring Rankin resolution No. 204, for Irish independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Memorial of Newport County Medical Society, urging the passage of the Dyer bill, giving advanced rank to officers in the Medical Reserve Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH: Resolution of the United Irish Societies of Chicago, asking that Ireland may be made an independent republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of Mrs. C. S. Thorp and 11 citizens of Battle Creek, Mich., against intemperance; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. STAFFORD: Petition of the Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York, against tax on life insurance premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of the Rhode Island Fish and Game Protective Association, favoring the passage of the migratory treaty bird law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of members of the Larimer County Medical Society, favoring bill for higher rank for medical officers in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of the Employers' Association of the Lower Naugatuck Valley, Derby, Conn., favoring amendment to revenue bill relative to payment of excess profits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of J. S. Miller, pastor of Methodist Episcopal Church, and 70 other citizens of Wimbledon, N. Dak., praying for national prohibition; also a resolution of the same import by the congregation and pastor of Methodist Episcopal Church, of Harvey, N. Dak.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, March 26, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we know that every part of human activity leads to Thy throne; that to think out the problem of life is to think back to Thee. Thou art still the ruler of the universe. Thou dost still sit in judgment upon the conduct of men. We come to Thee in the midst of the Nation's alarm, in the midst of the great crisis that is upon us, and pray Thee, O God of our fathers, Thou who didst establish us, Thou who didst give inspiration to the founders of this Government to erect a government upon the principles of Thy revealed Word, to hear us this day. Give success to our arms. Lead us to victory. May brute force and hate not prevail over justice and truth and right. Grant, we pray, that the outcome of it all shall be for the glory of Thy name and the permanent establishment of a real peace and brotherhood in all the earth. For Christ's sake. Amen.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary (James M. Baker) read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1918.

To the SENATE:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOSIAH O. WOLCOTT, a Senator from the State of Delaware, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WILLARD SAULSBURY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WOLCOTT thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer and directed the Secretary to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. THOMAS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by G. F. Turner, one of its clerks, announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9352) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for an Assistant Secretary of War," approved March 5, 1890, and for other purposes, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. DENT, Mr. FIELDS, and Mr. ANTHONY managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 133) authorizing the granting of insurance under the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended by the act approved October 6, 1917, on application by a person other than the person to be insured, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SIMS, Mr. RAYBURN, and Mr. WINSLOW managers at the conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were thereupon signed by the Presiding Officer:

S. 1546. An act to permit the use of certain refined products of petroleum as stores on steam vessels carrying passengers;

S. 3129. An act to provide for the disposition of the effects of deceased persons in the naval service;

S. 3130. An act to amend section 1570 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

S. 3445. An act to authorize the payment of gun pointers and gun captains while temporarily absent from their regular stations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9571. An act to authorize the appointment of officers of the Philippine Scouts as officers in the militia or other locally created armed forces of the Philippine Islands drafted into the service of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9903. An act to provide for restoration to their former grades of enlisted men discharged to accept commissions, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution authorizing the assistant to the Secretary of the Interior to sign official papers and documents; and

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution amending the act of July 2, 1909, governing the holding of civil-service examinations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Hillsdale, Wyo., praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CURTIS presented resolutions adopted by the Kansas State Board of Agriculture, at a quarterly meeting held at Topeka, Kans., relative to the cost of production of wheat and the price the farmer receives as compared with other commodities, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. McLEAN presented petitions of sundry citizens of West Haven, Guilford, New Haven, and Rocky Hill, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Guilford Branch of the Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, of Guilford, Conn., and a memorial of the Litchfield Branch of the Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, of Litchfield, Conn., remonstrating against the adoption of a Federal suffrage amendment, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Fairfield County Medical Society, of Connecticut, praying for an advanced rank for officers of the Medical Corps of the Army, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. OWEN presented a petition of Private Soldier Post, No. 62, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Oklahoma, of Blackwell, Okla., praying for an increase of pensions to veterans of the Civil War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LODGE. I wish to read the following telegram:

BOSTON, MASS., March 24, 1918.

Senator HENRY C. LODGE,
Senate Office Building, Washington:

Resolved, That this mass meeting, held in the Park Square Theater, Boston, March 24, call upon our two Massachusetts Senators, Mr. LODGE and Mr. WEEKS, to do all in their power to secure the support of the Republican Party in the Senate to the national suffrage amendment by urging all Republican Senators to stand solidly in favor; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the President, the Vice President, the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, and to Senators LODGE and WEEKS, with the request that Mr. WEEKS read it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Adopted unanimously.

OLIVE MILLS BELCHES,

State Chairman Massachusetts Branch National Woman's Party.

In the absence of my colleague [Mr. WEEKS] and in his behalf, I have complied with the request of the telegram and have read it into the RECORD.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. OVERMAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 4135) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to provide for the appointment of a district judge, district attorney, and marshal for the western district of South Carolina, and for other purposes,' approved September 1, 1916," so as to change the time of holding courts in the western district of South Carolina, reported it with amendments.

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3945) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint Fred H. Gallup major of Field Artillery in the United States Army, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 331) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred Senate resolution 216, requesting information of the Secretary of War, reported it with amendments.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Pensions, submitted a report (No. 332) accompanied by a bill (S. 4193) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, which was read twice by its title, the bill being a substitute for the following Senate bills heretofore referred to that committee:

S. 36. William C. Black.
S. 37. James Golden.
S. 223. Elmer H. Martin.
S. 238. Kathryn B. Steiner.
S. 334. Anthony W. Presley.
S. 369. Pyrrhus Williams.
S. 600. Ellsworth E. Welch.
S. 666. Edward L. Frabe.
S. 671. Thomas S. Gher.
S. 893. Thomas E. Cruess.
S. 1437. George W. Gray.
S. 1524. John Stone.
S. 1724. Thomas Bailey.
S. 1896. Thomas Harrison.
S. 1944. Mary C. Christensen.
S. 2054. Mamie E. Bridgewater.
S. 2241. William Shoemaker.
S. 2272. Harry H. Hallock.
S. 2338. John Aldrich.
S. 2448. Luther C. Wright.
S. 2580. Albert P. Ramsey.
S. 2603. William W. Cook.
S. 2612. Robert L. McFarland.
S. 2841. George White.
S. 3176. Harvey Day.
S. 3188. Etta S. Jeffrey.
S. 3192. Martha H. Saers.
S. 3228. Abbie M. Peabody.
S. 3441. Richard McDermott.
S. 3492. John M. Taylor.
S. 3598. Lottie J. Miller.
S. 3641. Lawrence O. Loughlin.
S. 3660. Walter J. Hawthorne.
S. 3695. Murtha Doyle.

S. 3844. Israel Wood.
S. 3846. Sarah Whittle.
S. 3867. Catherine Grace.
S. 3891. Henrietta A. Forbes.
S. 3912. William W. Keyser.
S. 4016. Virginia A. Porter.
S. 4027. Edwin C. Gasque.
S. 4029. Charles H. Lufkin.
S. 4128. Sallie Hardwick.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Pensions, submitted a report (No. 333), accompanied by a bill (S. 4194), granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, which was read twice by its title, the bill being a substitute for the following Senate bills heretofore referred to that committee:

S. 204. William Colpetzer.
S. 205. Caroline W. Congdon.
S. 206. David Craft.
S. 210. Hezekiah Dixson.
S. 213. Josiah H. H. Feather.
S. 229. Uriah P. Getz.
S. 342. Simeon L. Coen.
S. 344. Hugh L. Eyler.
S. 571. Daniel R. Cokeley.
S. 575. George B. Douglass.
S. 579. Jacob J. Lee.
S. 581. Samuel McAtee.
S. 584. Levi Morris.
S. 595. Benjamin Taylor.
S. 596. James W. Toothman.
S. 612. Christopher C. Stemple.
S. 613. Leander N. Thornberry, now known as Frank H. Reynolds.

S. 766. Frederick J. Young.
S. 878. Henry Harrison, alias Thomas Carman.
S. 990. Samuel J. Evans.
S. 991. Samuel Cook.
S. 1055. Julius Cohn.
S. 1074. John T. Quinby.
S. 1110. Ira Bier.
S. 1112. Martin H. Conger.
S. 1117. Mitchell Larock.
S. 1118. Lewis T. Holstin.
S. 1135. George W. Welch.
S. 1137. Thomas R. Alway.
S. 1139. Benjamin F. Jacks.
S. 1151. William H. Thompson.
S. 1159. Nicholas Johnson.
S. 1160. James W. Dorman.
S. 1244. Davis B. Wilcoxson.
S. 1245. Minard Van Patten.
S. 1261. Ephraim Otto.
S. 1264. Daniel Newby.
S. 1281. James A. Rutherford.
S. 1282. Joseph H. Rowland.
S. 1287. Charles Rhodes.
S. 1292. Arthur M. Phillips.
S. 1297. Thomas C. Moore.
S. 1300. Elcazar L. Miner.
S. 1304. Francis Marsh.
S. 1337. Robert P. Gailer.
S. 1344. Henry W. Ela.
S. 1370. James H. Gunion.
S. 1381. Reuben H. Chapel.
S. 1392. Samuel S. Baird.
S. 1507. Albert G. Dodds.
S. 1509. Charles W. Lindsay.
S. 1510. Orlando S. Hartman.
S. 1511. Benton P. Wood.
S. 1519. Samuel Gray.
S. 1574. William H. H. Knight.
S. 1575. Mark P. Morton.
S. 1577. George W. Townsend.
S. 1578. Morey Mulliken.
S. 1584. William P. Cook.
S. 1585. John L. Bradford.
S. 1771. John J. Swain.
S. 1822. Daniel W. Green.
S. 1842. Edward Curtis.
S. 1855. Philander Wright.
S. 1865. Adam Flesher.
S. 1905. Rufus Reynolds.
S. 1957. James Inman.
S. 2057. George W. Hill.

S. 2058. Cyrus Fike.
 S. 2060. Joseph Bristow.
 S. 2063. Gilliam L. Craven.
 S. 2073. Jabez Smith.
 S. 2103. Albert B. Watrous.
 S. 2112. Anna Schiler.
 S. 2114. Walter Emerson.
 S. 2151. Thomas J. Walker.
 S. 2158. James H. Shutts.
 S. 2159. Henry Wheeler.
 S. 2160. Nathan Vanmetre.
 S. 2163. John M. Jones.
 S. 2282. Lyman F. Demind.
 S. 2339. George A. Stanhope.
 S. 2342. William M. Somers.
 S. 2345. Joshua A. Epperson.
 S. 2346. William F. Hicks.
 S. 2386. Thomas G. Higgins.
 S. 2388. Elisha L. Hyatt.
 S. 2397. Abner A. Ellis.
 S. 2409. Charles S. Lavanway.
 S. 2420. Franklin Johnson.
 S. 2426. David E. Seekins.
 S. 2427. Albert W. Hassan.
 S. 2499. Sanford Smith.
 S. 2564. Bennett B. Fuller.
 S. 2570. William H. Kelsay.
 S. 2599. Elijah Bullock.
 S. 2607. Thomas Dunam.
 S. 2610. William R. Jones.
 S. 2611. Elijah Borin.
 S. 2615. Joseph Wolf.
 S. 2628. Isaac B. Childs.
 S. 2629. Francis Dwyer.
 S. 2682. John L. Ridenour.
 S. 2708. Charles F. Ward.
 S. 2731. John M. Anderson.
 S. 2732. George H. Ross.
 S. 2797. John L. Downing.
 S. 2811. Thomas J. Wood.
 S. 2876. Melvin C. Wolf.
 S. 2899. Charles Woodall.
 S. 2903. Anthony Wilkinson.
 S. 2977. William F. Mullin.
 S. 2978. William I. Jones.
 S. 2993. Nathaniel Southard.
 S. 2999. John S. Birdsall.
 S. 3024. William H. Nott.
 S. 3025. Solomon J. Campbell.
 S. 3075. Christopher C. Ghearthart.
 S. 3108. John W. Morrill.
 S. 3115. William D. Bash.
 S. 3119. Joseph S. LeHew.
 S. 3147. Henry Chapman.
 S. 3150. Thomas Madigan.
 S. 3185. William H. Comstock.
 S. 3195. Grace E. Waterbury.
 S. 3209. William H. McGovern.
 S. 3210. Samuel H. McCormick.
 S. 3229. Jeremiah McBee.
 S. 3301. Oxley Johnson.
 S. 3320. George M. Sawyer.
 S. 3337. George O. Miller.
 S. 3352. Mary M. Shapr.
 S. 3353. Edward Mills.
 S. 3355. Isaac Williams.
 S. 3356. Reuben H. Neff.
 S. 3357. Elijah Roberts.
 S. 3359. John A. Van Loan.
 S. 3396. Gilbert L. Holmes.
 S. 3416. Robert Masters.
 S. 3428. Benjamin S. Waggener.
 S. 3429. Eri C. Tuller.
 S. 3443. Catherine A. Kanouff.
 S. 3449. Charles David Jackson alias David W. Jackson.
 S. 3452. Sarah S. Hubbell.
 S. 3456. John M. Stephens.
 S. 3457. Thomas W. Wilkey.
 S. 3487. Thomas W. Stone.
 S. 3534. John S. Jordan.
 S. 3550. Jennie L. Holmes.
 S. 3564. Philip Bixby.
 S. 3567. John McCracken.
 S. 3575. William H. Temple.
 S. 3584. Franz Nibler.
 S. 3604. Joseph Langenberger.

S. 3634. Frederick H. Barker.
 S. 3635. John W. Keffer.
 S. 3639. George W. Hamilton.
 S. 3643. Logan Russell.
 S. 3647. Joseph H. Chapman.
 S. 3666. Wesley J. Ladd.
 S. 3675. Richard Hardesty.
 S. 3677. James M. Alloways.
 S. 3678. Taylor Edwards.
 S. 3680. Marion Davis.
 S. 3681. William H. Cliff.
 S. 3682. Robert R. Robinson.
 S. 3683. Martin V. B. Clark.
 S. 3685. Anthon O. Kruger.
 S. 3686. James Hood.
 S. 3703. William H. Phillips.
 S. 3704. Barton O'Neal.
 S. 3707. Wesley Woodard.
 S. 3708. Robert D. Hunter.
 S. 3709. Zachariah R. Thornton.
 S. 3717. John Magorien.
 S. 3722. Godfrey Bohrer.
 S. 3747. Evan T. Jay.
 S. 3761. Elizabeth J. Edson.
 S. 3770. William J. Nelson.
 S. 3794. Warren H. Rhoades alias Orin Bush.
 S. 3811. Mathew W. Clark.
 S. 3812. Edward A. Rowley.
 S. 3819. Lydia Wixson.
 S. 3820. Charles F. Marble.
 S. 3822. William Mulloy.
 S. 3824. Frederick Zimmerman.
 S. 3826. Joseph O. Swigert.
 S. 3832. John M. Honeywell.
 S. 3837. James H. King.
 S. 3838. Emma J. Naylor.
 S. 3847. Alice Hersh.
 S. 3871. Edgar Taylor.
 S. 3889. Merritt S. Harding.
 S. 3921. Nora B. Higgins.
 S. 3924. Freeman A. Forbes.
 S. 3926. George J. Trask.
 S. 3927. Henry Wiese.
 S. 3951. August Schaeffer.
 S. 3975. Nathan L. Brass.
 S. 3976. John F. Jackson.
 S. 3996. George L. Jaquith.
 S. 3998. William H. Young.
 S. 4041. Albert J. McGannon.
 S. 4056. Amos B. Horton.
 S. 4089. Frank D. Russell.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS (for Mr. FERNALD):

A bill (S. 4195) for the relief of Sarah E. Church; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 4196) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Nicholson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 4197) granting a pension to Catherine N. Wilson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 143) to permit any and all members of the military or naval forces of the United States serving in the present war to accept decorations from the Government of any of the countries concurrently engaged with the United States in the prosecution of said war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENT TO LEGISLATIVE, ETC., BILL.

Mr. CURTIS submitted an amendment proposing to increase the salary of the minute and Journal clerk of the Senate from \$3,000 to \$3,600 per annum, intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—G. W. JOHNSON.

On motion of Mr. WALSH, it was

Ordered, That the papers accompanying the bill S. 2133, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, granting a pension to G. W. Johnson, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

WAR WITH GERMANY.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I have a manuscript, prepared by Dr. Henry Plumb, of Pleasanton, Kans., giving certain views as to why we are at war with Germany. I ask that the manuscript be referred to the Committee on Printing, with a view to having it printed as a public document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The matter will be referred to the Committee on Printing for action.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9352) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for an Assistant Secretary of War," approved March 5, 1890, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. HITCHCOCK, and Mr. WARREN conferees on the part of the Senate.

OUTPUT OF COAL.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Post of this morning published the statement which I now read. The headlines are:

"BUY COAL EARLY," PUBLIC AGAIN TOLD—PRODUCTION 500,000 TONS OFF LAST WEEK, GARFIELD SAYS.

More than half a million tons loss in coal production last week caused the Fuel Administration last night to reiterate warnings contained in the announcement of its zone distribution system that next winter's supplies of fuel should be laid in early to keep mines working to capacity. The falling off, if continued, officials said, would mean serious shortage in fuel next winter to those sections not forehanded enough to purchase in advance.

The Fuel Administration holds that having provided a normal and economical method of distributing fuel, it can not go further than its warning to consumers to purchase early in order to protect them from suffering later in the year. Accumulation of reserve fuel by the administration to fill shortages next winter is not considered either wise nor feasible.

Fuel Administrator Garfield in a letter to Senator THOMAS, who recently announced that Colorado mines were closing down because of low prices, says the committee of engineers which investigated the matter reported that the reduction in summer prices to encourage storage was made at the request of the Colorado operators' committee.

I dislike, Mr. President, to occupy unduly the time of the Senate in repeatedly calling its attention to the fuel situation in my State. If Colorado alone were interested in the problem, I should not do so, because however severe the situation might be it would only concern a very small portion of the Union.

The Colorado situation, Mr. President, according to this statement, which is assumedly from the Fuel Commissioner, is merely one of the trouble spots of a national situation and can be used perhaps as well, if not better, than any other in calling attention at this time not only to that situation but to its inevitable national consequences.

Mr. President, it is not true that the Colorado operators ever requested the commissioner to fix summer prices for their coal product. They did say that it had been their custom in years past, in order to encourage storage in the summer months, to reduce prevailing prices as an inducement to that end and that the custom would be adhered to.

The commissioner, in addition to severely cutting the established prices under which the operators were working, now deliberately informs the country that the added reduction for the summer months was made by the request of the operators.

Mr. President, I can conceive of no adequate illustration to convey the injustice of that statement. It is very much like holding up an innocent individual on the street, who, to save something, offers to make a small contribution and who is then robbed of practically all that he possesses plus an added amount upon an assumed request.

These operators under prevailing prices can and ought to encourage the storage of coal during the summer months as fully as possible, but a permanent decrease in the prices of coal supplemented by an added decrease of prices for the summer months necessarily spells suspension, if not ruin, to a very large proportion of the independent operators, and I protest with all my heart, Mr. President, against a statement emanating from official sources which tells the public that this added decrease was made by the request of the operators.

So much, Mr. President, for that phase of the statement I have read. It is a very insignificant part of it. Its most sinister feature is the acknowledgment by the commission of a present shortage of 500,000 tons per week in the output of the coal mines of the United States. That is the equivalent of 26,

000,000 tons for the current year, an amount, Mr. President, appalling in its magnitude and I fear much more appalling in its inevitable consequences.

Mr. President, the situation of the United States is graver perhaps than at any other time in its history. We need every possible resource of the Nation, and we need it now, if we are to prevail in the mighty struggle in which we were forced to engage for the preservation of our institutions and the honor of the Republic.

Food will win the war, say some; others that our manufactured output will do so. Mr. President, I aver deliberately that every available resource, food, fuel, clothing, the output of our great industries, the young manhood of the Nation, all these things, Mr. President, must be summoned to the support, possibly to the defense, of the country if we are to maintain our place among the nations and preserve in all their vigor the essential institutions of freedom and of justice.

The sale of liberty bonds will win the war, say some. Mr. President, the people of the United States have responded to calls for money with an enthusiasm and a generosity without parallel in the history of nations. They will continue to do so. But that, Mr. President, will not win the war unless the vast sums so contributed shall be used frugally and efficiently and unless they be supplemented by the encouragement of industry and by the forcing of production to the last degree in all lines of human endeavor.

Mr. President, coal is the foundation of our industries. Without it we are paralyzed industrially. Without it comfort and health are both jeopardized. It is as essential to a modern civilized industrial community as the pulsation of the blood through the arteries of the human system to sustain continued physical life. We may build ships but we can not operate them without coal. Our lines of communication over the country are as perfect as any system on earth. They can not be operated without coal. Our manufactories are equipped as efficiently as those of any other nation. Their capabilities of output are almost without limitation. Yet they can not turn a wheel in the absence of a coal supply.

The patriotism of a nation can not be maintained, Mr. President, through the winter season in any country, certainly not for two successive seasons in the midst of cold and suffering, without the means of supplying artificial heat. The splendid heroism of Washington at Valley Forge and his battered men, who stood behind him during that awful test of patriotic endurance, was put to the supreme test of devotion. I doubt whether their magnificent endurance could have been duplicated for a second winter.

We have felt, Mr. President, during the past cold season in many of our communities, and particularly among the poor and the needy, the absence of that most useful and indispensable material without which the rigors of our Northern climate mean suffering, sickness, and death.

But, Mr. President, during the present and coming season, in addition to supplying our manufactories, our railways, our vessels, and our own people with coal, comes the added obligation of extending that supply to our allies if we would keep them in line another 12 months in this terrible struggle. How can we expect the Englishman at home, the Italian standing behind his last barrier and holding back the overwhelming flood of vandalism, their people looking with anxious eyes to this country for aid and for sustenance—can we expect them, Mr. President, to stand steady and hold firm if the absolute essentials of life which they must depend upon this country to furnish shall fail them?

And there is France—heroic France—whose magnificent struggle against the tides of barbarism is the wonder of the world, who has kept the fires of liberty burning upon the altars during the past three and a half weary and bloody years, whose last supply of coal is now threatened by the advancing hordes of the Kaiser. What will become of France next winter unless we can furnish them with the coal that they must have, not only to keep their industries going and to produce the munitions of war but to shield their families, their wives and children from its cold and piercing blasts.

Oh, my God, Mr. President, when I consider the tremendous demands made and that must be made upon this country, the last reservoir and the last hope of civilization, when I consider that at this hour instead of an increased production the commissioner tells the country that the shortage is 500,000 tons a week, I shudder to think what is to become of the allies and of us next winter if this shortage continues? Where will that relief come which must come if democracy is to be saved and the institutions of America preserved from destruction?

It is that feature, Mr. President, of this announcement which gives me the gravest concern. The Kaiser is thundering at the

gates of Paris. His mighty legions are flushed with plunder and with victory. His insidious spy system and the dissemination of his subtle poison behind the ranks will find mighty support when the rigors of the next fall shall come if there do not come with them the absolute essentials not only to victory but to preserve the patriotism and the morale of the noncombatant population.

Patriotism, Mr. President, is a noble and uplifting impulse, but it can find no enduring place in the haunts of cold, of hunger, of misery, and of suffering. The two can not long coexist. We do not know what this strain is now. We have not yet been put to the test as have the peoples across the sea. But we know what will follow if through strain and stress the morale of our allies is broken.

Should we not, Mr. President, encourage production? Should we not at this fateful moment in history keep the cables busy with good news for those across the sea, assuring them of our redoubled efforts in their behalf and our own? Should we call "Hold the fort, for we are coming—coming 5,000,000 strong, with our treasure, our coal, and our food"? We can not do it, Mr. President, unless present matters are corrected. A shortage of 500,000 tons of coal in the month of March will, I fear, mean a much greater one in the month of April.

Mr. President, I have been criticized by some of my own people for the earnestness which I have displayed concerning the orders of the Fuel Administration and their effect upon the coal mines and operators of my own section of the State. Mr. President, there are no more patriotic people in this country than those whom I have the honor, in part, to represent upon this floor. The coal measures of Colorado exceed those of any coal section of the world. The people want to produce coal; they are begging for permission to produce it. Their miners are standing with their picks in their hands waiting for orders to use them, while here in Washington tyros are busily balancing the averages of cost and the averages of profit, then fixing prices that are suffocating to the trade and that must result in disaster.

Mr. President, this is no time for silence; no time for partisanship. I have been, Mr. President, all my life affiliated from conviction with one of the great parties of this country, but I would willingly see that party and every other party pass into oblivion rather than hesitate to speak here in protest against the menace of an admitted situation in the hope that the Nation may be aroused in some degree to the peril that confronts it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I only came into the Chamber a few minutes ago and I desire to inquire, has the Senator stated, or is he able to state, somewhere near the quantity of coal that could be produced in Colorado above the present quantity, if a wiser policy were adopted?

Mr. THOMAS. In my State, Mr. President, we produced last year 12,000,000 tons of coal. It was the purpose of the producers to increase that to 15,000,000 for 1918, as they could do and can do now, if they are permitted to make a living profit, without which, Mr. President, they can not contribute their proportion—their "bit"—to this mighty struggle.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I trust the Senator from Colorado will not think I am interrupting him with any desire to disconcert him, for I think he is suggesting one of the most important problems before the American people to-day, and I agree with him that this policy of suppressing production at this time, when production is vitally necessary, is absolute insanity.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, far be it from me to charge any undue or improper intention or to challenge the good faith of any man; I believe that those in charge of this great industry are doing what they think they ought to do; but, Mr. President, they should, like others, learn wisdom from experience, if they can learn it in no other way; and when this commission comes before the people with a cheerful statement that the shortage of coal for this week is 500,000 tons and upward, and for that reason urges all to begin the work of storage, it would seem they can not even from experience perceive the crisis which we are approaching with double speed in the coal supply during the spring and summer months of 1918.

My purpose, therefore, in speaking about it this morning as earnestly as I can is, if possible, to call public attention to this critical prospect, to the end that the people may speak with mighty protest for its avoidance.

Mr. President, I want nothing but good for my country. I am unable to see a silver lining upon the clouds that veil the immediate horizon from our view. I know that, however dark it is, if this mighty people will gird their loins about, resolve

that nothing shall prevent the accomplishment of their purpose in this war, inspired by the spirit which animated their fathers in winning independence and in establishing the greatest and freest Government on earth, we shall go forward to victory, regardless of the conditions with which we are at present confronted. Unless they do this, Mr. President, some time in the not distant future the Hun, gloated with victory and with booty, the invader of our soil, may sink his fangs into America and write "Mene, mene tekel upharsin" upon the bomb-shattered walls of an American Babylon.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. Agreeing entirely with all that the Senator from Colorado has so admirably and so eloquently said, I want to ask him, Is there any remedy at hand other than the repeal of the law?

Mr. THOMAS. I hope so, Mr. President. I am prepared to support any remedy, to advocate the prospect of any remedy that will bring home to all our people a realizing sense of our overwhelming peril. For that reason I have taken the time of the Senate this morning, I hope for the last time, upon this very important subject.

REGISTRATION FOR MILITARY SERVICE—PROSECUTION OF THE WAR.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am obliged to leave the Senate for an important conference on the financial corporation bill, and I therefore ask unanimous consent of the Senate, and their indulgence, to say a few words occupying but a few minutes, in regard to the bill which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] will presently call up and to which has been offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] an amendment providing for universal military training.

I have long supported the purpose of that amendment. I believe in it most thoroughly. I am not going to take the time of the Senate at this moment to argue it. I advocated it as a measure of preparation before war came; I advocate it as a measure of preparation now that the war is here; I advocate it because I believe that in war or in peace the training that would thus be given would be of value to us as a people. I especially urge it at this time because, in my belief, it would enable us to have the young men of this country ready, when they were called upon in the draft, to take their places in the ranks trained and disciplined. It is above all as a measure of immediate value and immediate preparation that I advocate it. How many more bitter lessons must we have in order to learn the necessity of preparation and of taking every step possible to meet the terrible situation which is now upon us?

This is one thing which we can do; but there is another thing, Mr. President, which I wish to say this morning, and I am encouraged thereto by the example of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], and that is to tell the truth upon certain subjects to the American people. The fate of the war is trembling in the balance. Our gallant allies are holding back the German advance at enormous sacrifice and with a courage which goes beyond the range of eulogy. In this dark hour it is a crime to keep from the American people facts well known to our enemies, but about which our own citizens are misinformed.

We know here and we have known for weeks, as the Germans have known, that we have no fighting planes in France. The Secretary of War spoke a short time ago of our beginning to send fighting planes to France. He said the number was small, but we had begun to send them. We returned at that time the two French models which we had had here. Since then I believe one American plane has gone; it may be on the water now; it may have been landed. The heavy Liberty motor, according to the best information I can get, may be developed so as to furnish adequate power for bombing planes. The light motor does not show a capacity for fighting planes. We have not a fighting plane in France. The front where our men are not defended in the air. The French and the English have use for every plane they can bring up, and our men are not defended at all.

We have spent \$840,000,000 for aeroplanes in the past year, and we have not a fighting plane in France. I was shown a statement from the Aero Club of America saying that what was needed was money—three thousand million dollars to build aeroplanes. Mr. President, we have granted powers and we have given money without stint; but appropriating money and granting powers will lead to nothing unless the money is wisely expended and the powers are efficiently exercised. This idea which some persons seem to have that all that is necessary is to appropriate money and utter brave words in order to end the war is one of the worst delusions which ever tempted a people to destruction.

The facts I have recited in regard to aeroplanes are known to Germany. It is time our people understood them.

We have no guns in France, except a few old coast guns which we sent out early and for which the French are making carriages. We are using French guns. That is the hard fact. We decided to make 75-millimeter guns. We got the French plans; they gave us everything, including the secret of the recoil, and six months were wasted while we were trying to improve the best recoil of the best gun in the world, and now we have no guns. We have gone back to the French plans, with six golden wasted months behind us.

We have turned out two American ships, according to the best information I can get. The country is told about 26, or whatever the number is. We have been finishing some commandeered foreign ships; we have commandeered other ships; but we have got only two American ships, and yet the Shipping Board has been in existence since September, 1916. Two American ordered and built ships is our whole contribution thus far to the new tonnage of the world.

Mr. President, it is to the last degree painful to say these things, but they are the truth. The facts are there to be dealt with. I have the deepest confidence in the American people, and I believe they should not be misled with tales of what we are about to do and not be told what we have done and what we have failed to do. Let them know the truth; whether it is bad or good, let them have the truth. If they have the truth and they see the difficulties, it will arouse the American spirit—not merely the spirit of generous patriotism with which they have come forward to give their sons and their brothers, their money, and their time to the country, but the grim determination, the hard setting of the teeth which was shown on both sides during the Civil War. Tell them the truth; tell them where we are to-day.

The world looked to us a year ago and said we had come to the rescue of the situation. If the situation is ultimately to be saved, it can only be saved by the resources and the man-power of the United States. We have a good draft law; it has been well administered. We got the men; we can get more men; but, apart from that, what have we to show in accomplishment? A wasted year.

Mr. President, the only relief that I can see is to appeal to the spirit of the American people. You can not do that if you deceive them. Tell them the truth. Let them know the dangers and the perils in which they are; that we are fighting for freedom, for civilization, for all that makes life worth living; and that we may be fighting before very long for our very existence as an independent nation. It is no time to deceive ourselves. Let us look facts in the face. I for one have held my peace a long time, but the day has gone by when it is right to hold our peace.

What I said is well known to Senators on both sides of the Chamber; just as well known as it is to me—better known, by far, to the members of the Committee on Military Affairs, which has done such great work during the past winter. But, Mr. President, I for one will no longer stand by in silence.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. KELLOGG. I should like to ask the Senator why it is that the Military Affairs Committee have not published the testimony of Mr. Gifford and Gen. Wood and others who appeared before them?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am not on the committee. I have no fault to find with them. I think they have done great work. I am far from having a criticism on anything they have done. I praise them in every respect. They will give us the testimony of which the Senator speaks whenever they think it right to do so. All I want to say is that I, for one individual, one American—that is all—want my people to know just what the situation is, and then they will rise up and meet it; but if they do not know, they never will.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I think it is proper to say that the President has appointed a committee which is at the present time undertaking a thorough investigation of the aircraft production matter, and that the War Council, with which the Military Affairs Committee meets each Saturday, has been promised a statement next Saturday of the facts thus developed up to that time.

I am not combating in any degree the statements made by the Senator from Massachusetts. The Military Affairs Committee, which has gone far in revealing failures and proposing reforms, has been criticized already in certain quarters for what it has done. At the present time it is engaged in an effort to cooperate with the War Department, the organization of which has been immensely improved since the investigations of the Military Affairs Committee commenced. I should not speak

for the committee, as the chairman is here, but I believe I am safe in saying that the committee will give to the Senate as rapidly as possible any information or recommendation which may be of value regarding this aircraft matter. The committee is naturally under some restraint. It has a public duty to perform but can not make public all the information that comes to it and all the rumors that come to it. But an investigation is now in progress, and the Senator from Massachusetts will be gratified and the country will be gratified when that investigation has progressed a little more in having revealed the exact truth. There is, so far as I know, no disposition to conceal it. Whatever the mistakes of the past may have been—and they have been enormous—I believe they are in course now of being cured.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, it is quite encouraging to hear the Senator from Nebraska assure the Senate that there is a prospect that on next Saturday, or some other time in the future, the United States may get information as to what is being done in regard to the production of airplanes. That is quite a considerable progress for the United States to have made after it has been engaged for a year in the most desperate war that the world has ever seen.

I am somewhat surprised at the statement of the Senator from Nebraska, because my impression was that the substantial facts in regard to the airplane situation were known to the entire world. They are very simple. There is nothing complicated about the matter. The facts are admitted by those who are responsible for the production of airplanes. Nobody denies them, that I have ever heard. The substantial, fundamental fact in the situation is that we have been engaged for a year in this war, which the Senator from Massachusetts says may ultimately result in a struggle for the independence of this Nation, and that we have no airplanes. That is all there is about it.

I should like to know if the Senator from Nebraska is informed of the fact that the plan of those who have been made responsible for the expenditure of about a billion dollars which the Congress of the United States has appropriated for the production of this essential of modern warfare is that we are not going to have any airplanes at all, at any time, so far as fighting battle planes are concerned?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. Does the Senator from Nebraska know that that is the deliberate purpose and plan of this administration?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Since the Senator asks me the question, I am perfectly free to make an answer so far as I am acquainted with the facts.

In the first place, the Senator's statement that the facts are all known to the world is true, so far as the fact goes that we are probably many days behind time in the delivery of combat airplanes. Substantially, we are not behind time in the delivery of training airplanes, of which we have about 2,000. When I stated that an investigation was being made, I meant that an investigation is being made to develop who is responsible for the present delinquency in the delivery of combat airplanes.

Referring now to the last question of the Senator, I may say that we have every assurance in the Military Affairs Committee that a certain number of combat planes will be ready for delivery on the 1st of July.

Mr. POINDEXTER. What does the Senator mean by "combat planes"?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I mean planes to be used in combat—the highest type of combat planes.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator does not seem to have the understanding of that term that the Aircraft Production Board has. We saw here the other day an exhibition of a combat plane, not made in this country, because there have been none made here, but made in France and brought here after we had been engaged in this war for a year, in order that here, at the Capital of the Nation, we at last might be given an exhibition of an aviator flying in a battle plane which we were not able to provide for ourselves; and, if I am correctly informed, we never will be able, under the administration and the plans and purposes of the Aircraft Production Board, to see as the product of American genius the spectacle of a battle plane such as that that was exhibited to us here on Sunday afternoon, because it is not the intention of this administration to make any of those planes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the Senator there is in error, unless the committee has been entirely misinformed.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The committee has been misinformed.
Mr. HITCHCOCK. Let me state to the Senator approximately the facts.

Last summer the Aircraft Production Board, in the excess of very oversanguine expectations, promised the country an enormous number of combat planes by a certain date of the present year. I think it was fixed at 20,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Twenty-two thousand.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. A very foolish and a very impossible estimate. Later on, about October, that estimate was reduced to 15,000. Later on, approximately in November some time, the estimate was reduced, as I recall, to 7,000. On the 1st of December it was again reduced, and it has been reduced since that time, say, on the 1st of January or some time in February, until it is now only about one-tenth of the original delivery promised by the 1st of July. It is true, however, that combat planes are being made. A number have been made in the United States—a very small number, it is true. I am not going to tell the number that are already in existence in this country. It is a ridiculously small number. It will be a larger number in April, and a still larger number in May.

I do not think it is proper to say that the manufacture of combat planes has been abandoned. It may be true that the liberty motor will not be used in the combat planes that are constructed, because the international conferences have developed the fact that possibly another motor may be superior to the liberty motor for combat planes, and the use of the liberty motor may be confined to the bombing planes; but it is not true that America will abandon the manufacture of combat planes, because America can not do that thing. France is now going to her limit in the manufacture of combat planes and is unable to deliver combat planes to us; and it is for that reason that our aviators across the water are not now flying in combat planes, because France is not able to deliver any to them.

What the Senator from Massachusetts said, however, is not strictly correct—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I prefer that the Senator should answer the Senator from Massachusetts in his own time.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It will only take a moment, if the Senator will allow me to finish this. Our line is not entirely without protection, because French aviators do to a considerable extent, and to the extent that they are able, protect our line at the present time.

Mr. POINDEXTER. We ought to be very proud of the fact that we are depending upon the French for protection on our battle line.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. It may perhaps be illuminating to inform the Senator what the opinion of the Aero Club of America is regarding our shortage of planes. I read from a clipping from a New York paper of date March 19:

Lack of funds has prevented the United States from carrying out an aircraft program which will gain and maintain the allies' supremacy in the air, according to a statement issued to-night by the Aero Club of America.

Recommendation is made that an appropriation of \$3,000,000,000 be made by Congress for the work. The present appropriation is \$640,000,000.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is a little more than that. There was only \$640,000,000 in one appropriation, but there have been several appropriations for this purpose.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MYERS. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington how he knows that it is the plan of this administration not to have any fighting airplanes?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will give the Senator my information. Of course, I am not in the confidence of the administration. It is deduced from circumstances which surround the articles that are published in the newspapers.

Mr. MYERS. Then, I will say, if the Senator will permit me, that it appears to be simply the opinion and conclusion of the Senator, not the announcement of an authentic fact.

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; it is an announcement of a fact. I do not claim to be infallible. My conclusion may not be correct, but I believe that it is. Whether or not it is correct is subject to determination upon all the circumstances which anybody can produce. If the Senator has any better information, let him produce it, and let the world decide what the truth of the case is.

Mr. MYERS. Then it simply seems to resolve itself down to a statement and assertion of the Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have not had an opportunity, on account of interruptions, to give the source of my authority. I am going to undertake to do it.

There have been a great many publications made of the admissions of the Aircraft Production Board similar to that which was quoted just now by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], apparently with an easy assurance that everything is all right. He says that this program is coming along, and that it will be only 90 days behind the schedule. Mr. President, the fate of nations is often decided in 90 days. My recollection is that France was conquered and put under the heel of the German emperor in less time than that in the War of 1870-71.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not put me in the light of an apologist. I certainly have not intended to appear in that light.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator, then, is not satisfied with the fact that the programme is 90 days behind time?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. By no means. The committee—

Mr. POINDEXTER. Why, Mr. President, this great battle that is now on in France will not last 90 days. It has already lasted only four days, and it has almost come to a decisive point. To come and say that we have performed our duty, that we have met with some discouragements but, notwithstanding those discouragements and obstacles, we are only 90 days behind the program, is to put the administration which is responsible for these things in an absurd position.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There is something in the Senator's tone which indicates that I am appearing as an apologist. I am not. I am a critic. I have been condemning and attacking and endeavoring to speed up. I am only rising for the purpose of stating the facts. I say this Nation has not abandoned its policy of building combat planes.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I say that it has. Has the Senator ever seen a battle plane produced in this country such as the French plane that was exhibited here the other day?

I have in my hand, Mr. President, a statement which bears the earmarks of authenticity. I am accustomed to weighing, with some discrimination, the merits of newspaper publications and undertaking at least to determine how much credence they are entitled to; and this one bears all the evidences of having come from interviews with the officials who have charge of this work. In fact, it so states. On paragraph is that—while admitting that the airplane program is two months behind the original schedule—

Of course it is a great deal of satisfaction, Mr. President, when the fate of the Nation is to be determined, when defeat stares us in the face, to be confronted with the excuse that the schedule that was made for the equipment of the armies of this country was somewhat in fault. I have seen a number of statements to the effect that the number of airplanes and of guns and of machine guns was ahead of the schedule, and yet here is a statement that it is 60 days behind the schedule. Those statements come from the same sources. Which is correct? Has not the Senator from Nebraska, has not every Senator, seen those statements, put out from the various executive bureaus of the Government, that we are ahead of the schedule, that airplane production is ahead of the schedule? Well, what is the matter with the schedule? If our production of nothing at the end of a year is ahead of the schedule, who made the schedule, and why was it made upon that basis? And how does the Senator reconcile being ahead of the schedule with the statement which I have just read that we are 60 days behind the schedule and the Senator's statement that we are 90 days behind the schedule?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, there is no reconciliation. We are behind. I know we are at least 90 days behind.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator does not agree with the statements that have been put out from time to time that we are ahead of the schedule on aircraft production, then?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Of course I do not. I admit that, and I am not standing as an apologist. I object, however, to having the Senator state that this country has abandoned the construction of combat planes. This country has not abandoned that policy, and it can not abandon that policy.

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; I agree with the Senator; it can not abandon the policy, because it has never undertaken the policy. It has not any policy to build battle planes, according to the best information I can get.

I asked the Senator a moment ago what is the distinction, what the battle plane was, and he said it was a fighting plane. I have in my hand here a statement written by, I presume, a correspondent of the New York World, reported in the local Washington Times. The New York World is, I understand, a paper whose correspondent has the confidence of the administration and access to sources of information. Here is the statement contained there, and I believe it, Mr. President, because

of its intrinsic evidence of truth. It corroborates the substantial evidence of the Senator from Nebraska, together with the visible, ocular demonstrations which are open to everybody, or rather the lack of ocular demonstration of the existence of any battle planes after all the efforts we have made to obtain them. This statement says:

By combat planes is meant the machines used for raiding and observation purposes and for day and night bombing. The term does not include the single-seated light exclusively fighting planes—the thoroughbreds of the air—nor does it include elementary or advanced training planes. They are listed on separate tables. The delivery of elementary-school planes is well into the quantity stage, and the advanced planes will soon reach that point. The highly developed single-seated fighters are being built in France and England. America has never intended and does not now plan to build that type. She is too far away from the front, where changes in this class of aircraft are of almost weekly occurrence.

Now I believe that statement. I have heard it a number of times made here at every period when inquiry was made for information, and I shall continue to base my conclusion upon its accuracy until I have some evidence to the contrary which has not yet been produced, notwithstanding the inquiry and the testimony of witnesses which the Senator from Nebraska has heard as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The only element of truth in the statement of the correspondent read by the Senator, so far as I know, is that it has been argued that combat planes should be made near the seat of combat for the reason that they are compelled from week to week or at least from month to month to modify and change them according to the progress and development of the art of manufacture. It is probable—I do not know but that it is already the fact—that America will ship over the material partly constructed, to complete the manufacture of combat planes in France for the purpose of taking advantage of the latest changes; but that America will abandon the manufacture of combat planes is not true. We have that from very definite authority. We know that some of the combat planes are in existence this month and that more are promised for next month, and that we will have at least 2,000 of them by July unless present calculations go awry.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is in conflict with the statement of the correspondent I have just read. He states that the production of combat planes is not yet in the quantity stage, and he carefully explains that combat planes are the bombing planes, the heavy planes for raiding purposes, and not the light battle planes which are absolutely essential to protect our lines of battle from the observation planes and the bombing planes of the enemy.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield.

Mr. FALL. The Senator is right. The term combat plane to the ordinary layman or the average American citizen is considered as a scouting, fighting plane. As I understand the Senator, the combat plane is not only necessary for the protection of our men in the trenches, but it is necessary for the protection of both the bombing plane and the scouting plane. The object of the scouting plane is to carry information, to obtain photographs, and so forth. It must be protected against the attack of fighting planes; it can not protect itself. The scouting plane is in the same condition. Those planes are protected by the battle plane.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The only way they can be protected is by the fighting plane.

Mr. President, one other point I want to call attention to.

Mr. BORAH. Before the Senator takes that up, has he read an article in the New York World which purports to contain the report of a special agent of the President upon the situation with reference to aircraft—

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; I have not read it; but I will say in that connection that I have made no search for material for criticism of the Government. On the contrary, I have searched for evidences of good administration rather than bad, and it is only when things come to such a pass as to be a scandal to the entire world, in my judgment, that I have felt it necessary to call attention to them.

Mr. BORAH. This purports to be a report of the confidential agent of the President. It is not a criticism at all; it is a report made, and I assume it was put out authoritatively. It could not have been given to the public except in one way.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield to me just one moment?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I would much prefer that the Senator from Idaho complete his statement, and then I will yield.

Mr. KING. I just wanted to inquire of the Senator from Idaho, with the permission of the Senator from Washington, if when he speaks of confidential agent of the President he refers to Mr. Borghum.

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. KING. I think I can state to the Senator from Idaho that he does not occupy that relation to the President.

Mr. BORAH. Of course, I do not know. But the article states that by virtue of a letter received by the President on the 2d day of January this gentleman was authorized to make the investigation, and he made the investigation and made a report to the President, the report being confidential, and to the President. I take it it would not have been published in the New York World without a basis for the statement. But I read a single paragraph. If it is true, it is a terrible situation; and if it is not true, some correction ought to be made. If this report is not authoritative, it should be repudiated. The report says:

The general situation indicates a terrible state of confusion and irregularity, as report shows, due to self-interest and intrigue, together with predetermination to thwart the effort of our Nation and the work of able and trusted assistants.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I can state on my own knowledge at first hand that a gentleman high in the organization of the airplane construction board stated to me that there seemed to be in the effort to produce airplanes some mysterious unknown influence that was putting a blight upon the entire efforts of the board that he could not explain. I know something about the efforts of the board and something of why we have no airplanes. I know that of my own knowledge.

In that same article that I referred to a moment ago it was stated that one of the difficulties which have prevented the production of airplanes has been the difficulty of getting spruce. I know where the spruce is. There are quantities of it in the State I in part represent and in the adjoining State of Oregon, and I myself have presented to the gentlemen who have been delegated to produce the airplanes the offer of men of wealth, of character, of patriotism, to produce and deliver to them all the spruce that they needed; men who are able to make good their word; men who could produce and deliver the spruce in record time if there had been merely one word of consent. But that consent was refused. They were unable to get permission to produce spruce, and yet it is said that the reason why we have no airplanes is because they could not get spruce. I know they could have gotten spruce not 60 days or 90 days ago but 6 months and 9 months ago. All the spruce that was needed could have been had for the asking for it and the payment of a reasonable price, to be fixed by the Government itself.

I also know something, Mr. President, in this connection, about the reason for the delay and failure to have ships. There are in my State great harbors. There are men skilled in building ships. There are men there with the resources and the capital who do not need to come to New York or anywhere else to secure the necessary funds to carry on their operations; men who are experienced in the construction of ships; men who have had organizations of employees ready at their bidding to carry out their contracts. I made offers on their behalf to the Shipping Board months ago and have informed the Shipping Board that I knew that if these men agreed to deliver a ship the ship would be delivered. Their record of accomplishment, the means which they possess, was a guarantee that the ship would be delivered in accordance with any agreement they made; and I was unable to get permission for these men, who were largely actuated by patriotic motives in offering to assume these contracts, because there are many other avenues of employment with a profitable return in which they have been engaged. But their offers were refused. They were delayed from week to week and month to month before they could get any answer at all.

In the meantime the lines of ships that carry the lifeblood of the Nation across the sea were being destroyed by the German submarines, while month after month men who were, in September, 1916, commissioned with authority to produce ships quibbled about preparations and about time and about specifications. Men have known how to produce ships that would sail the seas and carry freight to the people of the world long before the men who sit upon this Shipping Board were born. The members of the Shipping Board held no exclusive knowledge of the plans and specifications of ships. There are great organizations in the world whose business it is to determine whether a ship is seaworthy in order that they may insure it, and if a ship is built that comes within the rules and regulations of their register it is a sufficient ship for the needs of a Nation that is fighting for national existence.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. POINDEXTER. In just a moment. Those shipbuilders were ready to comply with those regulations and those condi-

tions, and they were not only not sought but their offers were positively declined.

Mr. OVERMAN. Does the Senator think this is a proper time, admitting everything to be true, to discourage the American people in the saddest hour of our history during the war? Does he think it is the proper course to take on the floor of the Senate? Sometimes silence is golden.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I infer from what the Senator from North Carolina says that if these things are true that I say are true we should remain silent about them. I have remained silent about them for a long time.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator is taking this opportunity, when I say we are in great distress, to discourage the American people, when we need to have them enthused instead of being disheartened.

Mr. POINDEXTER. This is not going to discourage the American people.

Mr. OVERMAN. It discourages everybody. Now is the time for all men to be true and to be silent about matters that we may admit to be true.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not agree with the Senator. I think there comes a time after a while when silence and forbearance is a fault. I will tell you it is the duty of the Senator from North Carolina and of other patriotic citizens not merely to be silent but to exert yourselves to improve the administration and the efforts of the Government.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator is here at this time criticizing the administration because of mistakes, when it is doing the best it can to carry on the war.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am here for the purpose of pointing out what the Senator is seeking to cover up—an undisputed and scandalous failure of the administration.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask the Senator, admitting what he says to be true, is this the proper time for the Senator to be throwing it out to the American people, when they ought to be enthused? I think the Senator is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; I am not; but that does not make any difference.

Mr. OVERMAN. I thought the Senator was. He is making statements here. I do not know whether they are true or not. They may be true, but I say we ought to correct these mistakes, but correct them in the proper way. Every man here on the floor wants to correct them. Every man here, I think, is a patriot; and why does the Senator stand here, at this very time when we are in a serious condition, to make the people of America unhappy and discourage them? This is not the time. I want every effort made to correct the errors, if there are errors. It is a time for everybody to get together and correct these errors.

Mr. POINDEXTER. How can everybody get together and correct the errors if everybody does not know about the errors?

Mr. OVERMAN. I think every Senator on this floor is trying to correct them. I know we have the Military Committee, which is a great committee, that has been investigating these matters; and they will be corrected.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is encouraging. I am glad to know that they will be corrected. It may be that the discussion here this morning may lead toward that end.

Mr. OVERMAN. The point I make is that the Senator from Washington is stirring up trouble in the country.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If it stirs up trouble, Mr. President, in order to point out the actual situation we are in, with a view of remedying that situation, with a view of changing this policy of nonproduction and removing the secret influences and mysterious blight that are thwarting the efforts of the administration, then it is time to understand that situation, in order that everybody, as the Senator from North Carolina says, may unite to bring about a successful issue of this war.

Mr. OVERMAN. My point is that the Senator is not going about it in the right way, and I do not believe—if he will allow me to say so—it the best way to do it at this time.

Mr. FALL. Will the Senator from Washington yield to me? The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. FALL. As I understand, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] is now in charge of a bill providing that absolute power be vested in the President of the United States, and that the Senator is going to insist upon the passage of that bill. I am one of those who have advocated, or at least who have voted for, practically every particle of legislation of that character; I am not at all sure that I shall not support as strongly as I can the bill, the passage of which the Senator will urge; but, Mr. President, as an American I am exactly in the

frame of mind which was so eloquently and so forcefully expressed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] this morning—one who would see his party sink to the uttermost depths of hell rather than that the people should suffer any further from inaction and failure and want of knowledge; one of those who would rather vote absolutely autocratic powers to the President; but I do want to know what the President is doing with the powers which have already been given. For that reason I think that a discussion of this kind as to evident failures, which we all know, every one of us, the Senator from North Carolina as well as I, or else the Senator who says he is seeking for information has not been in fact seeking for such information.

As one of those who recognizes that failures have been made, I think that the time has come for the application of remedies. I do not think that the President himself can be reached in any way except by the knowledge that the people of the United States are finally getting information which, apparently, he has not yet assimilated.

Mr. OVERMAN. I say to the Senator that I agree with him and I fully indorse the sentiments which have been expressed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], but I do not think the floor of the Senate is the proper place to discuss these matters at this time. I think it ought to be done by the committee; that that is the proper place to do it.

Mr. FALL. If I may trespass upon the time of the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] a moment longer, I desire to say that the Senator from North Carolina calls himself a Democrat and I have been called a Republican. I believe, as a Democrat and as a Republican and as a citizen, and I have always so believed, that the people of the United States can attend to their business and can force their administrative and their legislative officers to attend to their business as it should be attended to if they are informed. Time and again here I have said that I was never afraid of inflamed public opinion if public opinion had an opportunity to inform itself. I say, with due respect to the President of the United States, that he is simply representing as an Executive, or he should represent as an Executive, the wishes and desires of the people of the United States as expressed through their legislative officers elected by them for that purpose. He should execute the laws which this Congress passes, and should administer the powers which they vest in him for the protection of the American people. I have been willing to vote the very ultimate power to the President; but I as one now say to you, sir, that I shall demand, as an American citizen, to know how those powers are being administered, not only with reference to the construction of airships but with reference to the control of the business of this country; with reference to the placing of our men in the trenches, where they may be captured to-day or may be dying by the thousands.

I want knowledge and I want the people to have that knowledge. I am one of those who differ from the Senator from North Carolina. I am not afraid of the people knowing.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] that there is no lack of channels under this administration through which information can be conveyed to the American people of the conditions as they exist to-day. I hold in my hand here, Mr. President, a list of the governmental publicity bureaus—I should say a partial list. I want Senators to understand that there are over 47 of them that I have recorded upon these pages [exhibiting]—47 governmental publicity bureaus. There is no lack of agencies on the part of this Government to see that information reaches the farthest ends of the country, in all the homes of the people; but I will undertake to say to the Senator that I do not believe that one of those agencies has published one thing in the way of criticism or calling the attention of the American people to the unfortunate position in which we find ourselves to-day.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think that is true.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I shall conclude in just a minute, if the Senator pleases.

Mr. President, I have as much interest in the success of the American Army on the battle front in France as has the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], but when we read from day to day the utterances of soldiers in the trenches to the effect that they see German bombing and gas planes flying over their lines and back of their lines, and that they have no means of protecting themselves except such as may be afforded them through the friendship and the common interests of our French

allies, I think that devotion to that cause demands that any effort that I may be able to make in the way of publicity or otherwise be put forth to lead to the production of airplanes to accompany the other branches of our military service in France in order that they may be protected and that they may have opportunity to gain the victory which we all expect, but which will be impossible unless they are thoroughly supplied with airplanes.

One thing to which I object is the explanations and excuses which are made by those officials who are responsible for the production of the equipment of our Army. I have here a statement, recently published in the newspapers, in which these officials proceed to say that they have been successful because they have spent so many billions of dollars of money and have employed so many clerks in their offices. I do not think that is a proper standard of success. I admit they have spent billions of money; I admit that they have employed thousands and tens of thousands of clerks, but I say that when they have expended that money and employed this army of employees and assistants, and after the expiration of a year, when we are confronted with the fact, which I believe is not denied, that we have no machine guns, that we have no cannon except those that are supplied to us by our friends and allies in France, it is time to give public utterance to those facts and to call the attention of the country and the world to them.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SHERMAN. In view of the statement made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] that there are 47 publicity agents, I will ask the Senator if he cares to express his opinion as to the output of those agencies proportioned to the effort and the expense involved?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Well, I have here in my hand a statement, evidently coming from executive officers, with the heading, "Sixteen cannon plants ready for operation." Upon reading it I find that instead of 16 cannon plants being ready for operation, the statement is to the effect that negotiations are in progress which, it is hoped, will lead to the establishment of 16 cannon plants. That is the progress that we have made a year after we entered the war.

So it is said that another accomplishment has been the—expenditure of approximately \$40,000,000 for plant facilities to manufacture artillery cannon, with an estimate that \$300,000,000 will be spent for cannon alone within two years after the outbreak of the war.

I do not dispute those facts. It may very well be that they have spent \$40,000,000 already for plant facilities, and that they have made estimates to expend \$300,000,000 more, but if the amount were \$300,000,000,000 and they had produced no cannon, it would not be an evidence of the performance of their duty.

So it is said—and this is a peculiar excuse, which is put out for the situation of affairs—that—

By June of this year the memorandum said—

And this memorandum was put out by the Assistant Secretary of War—

the division will have a staff of 1,500 officers and 10,000 civilians.

That is quite an accomplishment, to get 1,500 officers and 10,000 civilians employed, if the standard of success in preparing this country to carry on this war is the number of officers and the number of civilians employed; but, however great the number of officers and however many thousands of civilians may be employed, it is very poor satisfaction to the country, in the time of a crisis such as this, if we have no results in the way of equipment or arms from that great establishment.

It was said a moment ago by one Senator that very soon we may be fighting for our national existence. Well, the trouble is that there are too many people in this country who are not in favor of independent national existence, and they have received entirely too much encouragement. There is a doctrine called "internationalism," which means a surrender of independent national existence and a merger with all of the different peoples of the world, which is openly preached and advocated by a considerable number of people. Not long ago I was very much surprised to hear read upon the floor of the Senate, with the approval and eulogy of distinguished and patriotic Senators, a letter from a gentleman by the name of Thompson, which contained a fulsome eulogy of Trotsky and Lenine, German traitors masquerading under the guise of Russians, who sold out their adopted country and who do not believe in the doctrine of independent nationality, but believe in that counter and inconsistent doctrine of what they call "internationalism."

Not long since we saw official utterances from the President of the United States, in which he offered encouragement to this

misnamed government of Russia, which in the name of liberty has sacrificed the Russian people to the most tyrannical autocracy, perhaps, that any government has ever developed.

We have an ally in whom we are very much interested on the Pacific coast, an ally that has scrupulously kept her engagements in this war, an ally that has lived up to the best traditions of western civilization, although she has but recently acquired it. The great Empire of Japan has been a faithful ally to the United States and the other democracies of the world in this war; and yet, in the face of the advancing German influence in Russia, in the face of an army of German and Austrian prisoners who had been released and who, the papers this morning state, are gathering into an army in Siberia, fully equipped with machine guns, with powder, and with cannon, and although Japan is ready and willing, in pursuance of her obligations to her allies, in perfect good faith to do for Russia in the face of the German menace what we in our feeble and inefficient way are seeking to do for France, to send her troops there to stem that tide, to protect our Pacific coast, to protect the great store of railroad material and of war equipment which the taxes of our people have provided and assembled at Vladivostok, instead of offering a hand of encouragement, instead of showing our gratitude, we offer discouragement; we indicate, in the face of all the good faith that Japan has displayed, a doubt of her intentions. Consequently we leave this great drama of the secret machinations between the bolsheviks of Russia and the German Kaiser to go on, spreading their net around the liberties of the Russian people, gathering up her resources and consolidating their gains, organizing the Russian railroads, preparing to use all of the material of food and of men—because the men will be but slaves working under German military commanders—and to produce the materials with which Germany will meet France and England and the United States on the western front; and we not only sit idly by while that is going on but we dissent; we object to the help which the generous hand of Japan is proffering us.

We object to this disinterested policy on the part of Japan—I call it disinterested because I can readily see that it would be to the interest of Japan to conserve her forces, to keep her army intact, to maintain undiminished her supply of guns and powder. She offers to use them for the allied cause. From the statesmen of France and England come words of encouragement and of good faith, but from the American Government comes only dissent and refusal not only to assist but to consent for Japan to engage in this undertaking.

What can we expect from a foreign policy such as that? Time and time again there have been difficult and more or less acute issues between Japan and the United States in the Pacific, and there are certain plain and fundamental principles in which the people of the Pacific coast are not only interested but upon which they have planted themselves irrevocably. One of them is that the Pacific coast is for the people of the United States. It is a branch of that doctrine by which the United States has said to Europe and to Asia, in effect: "Do not interfere in the affairs of the Americas." Now, I am in favor of that doctrine. It is essential to our safety and to our future prosperity. But if we assume that attitude—that Japan must keep her hands off from the Western Hemisphere—Japan must expand in some other direction. She must find food for her people, room for her increasing population, somewhere on the face of the earth. We have said to her: "You can not find it in America"; yet because of an unfounded doubt, even as to her intentions on the mainland of Asia, we refuse to accept her assistance in meeting the German menace in Siberia. I say that it is a mistaken policy.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator inform us what information he has that is official about that? The newspapers, perhaps, have said it, but does the Senator believe everything he sees in the newspapers?

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; I do not believe everything I read in the newspapers, but I undertake to pick out of things in the newspapers those which I do not believe and those things which I do believe. I have been accustomed for a good many years to consider the credibility of witnesses in the light of circumstances; and when I see a situation which is known to everybody to exist in Siberia, and when the universal statement is not only in the newspapers but everywhere, from Europe and Asia and America, that Japan is willing and ready to use her army and her fleet to protect the property of the allies and the interests of the Russian people, and when that enterprise is stopped, is not carried out, in the face of the great need for it, when the crisis is acute, I do believe in the face of that corroborating circumstance that our administration has refused to give its assent.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I do not profess to speak from any more knowledge than any other Senator has. I confess to an ignorance about as deep as I think all of us have of the relations between Japan and Russia and the probable effect of an assault by Japan upon Russia, and whether as between the German assault on the one side and the Japanese assault on the other Russia in its disorganized condition might not immediately join the forces of Germany itself in an assault on Japan. So that it is a very serious question, and not to be laid down, it strikes me, as a matter of mere unquestioned dictum that it is a proper thing to rush in there. I do not know. I am not in the confidence of those who are in touch with these matters; but those things have occurred to me while the Senator was speaking. I do not know what effect a Japanese invasion might have on the Russian people, especially as Russia is absolutely headless and has gone to pieces. Suppose that under the machinations which Germany has so successfully practiced in more than one country she should persuade Russia that her interest lies in standing with Germany against a Japanese invasion?

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is a confirmation of the proposition which the Senator from South Carolina questioned. The views and the doubts expressed by the Senator from Arizona, with his means of access to the executive branch of the Government, confirm the public report that the administration entertains the same doubts that the Senator from Arizona has just expressed.

Now, while we are doubting, while the President is doubting—and I have no desire to embarrass the President in any way; I agree with him generally, and want to support him in every way possible—and while the Senator from Arizona is doubting whether we ought to act, Germany is not doubting. Germany is not hesitating. She has the ability to decide and to act, while we have only the ability in this particular matter to debate and doubt and hesitate; and while we are doubting the fate of Russia and her position in this war are being fixed and settled forever.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I will suggest, if the Senator will permit me, that sometimes people walk in where other individuals or spirits are afraid to tread. This is not a matter of fear, but it is a matter of common sense. It strikes me that if this country is in the deplorable condition that the Senator has been an hour telling about, we are in a very poor attitude from that standpoint to say that we will just rush in anyhow, volens volens, prepared or not, and take on another coast in a war that is giving us about as much as we can attend to across the Atlantic. It seems to me that instead of laying down a course of action for the President, who probably has as wide a field and as many facts to deal with as we, I for one, at least, would be very careful before I laid down the absolute dictum that he was making an enormous mistake in a matter of this importance.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is not a dictum, Mr. President; it is the expression of an opinion.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. Just a moment. Although it is somewhat embarrassing to differ with the President, it has always been the practice in the United States for American citizens to be guided by their own judgment and their own opinions in these matters; and whether the Senator from Arizona is right or the President—who, I understand, occupies the same position on this question that he does—is right, or whether those who differ from him are right, must be determined in the light of events. The thing to be ascertained is not what the opinion of the President is or his judgment about these matters. Many Presidents have made mistakes. The thing to be ascertained is the truth.

I may not find it; the Senator from Arizona may not find it; but in the expression of conflicting opinions, and in calling the attention of the public in order that that great agency of democracy, an enlightened public opinion, may have an opportunity to operate, we may be able to ascertain the truth in this matter.

Mr. KING and Mr. SMITH of Arizona addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Utah, as he rose first.

Mr. KING. I will defer to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I was only about to suggest, in the line of the argument the Senator has already made in his expressed admiration of the go-to-it-ness of the German people, that I have never seen any particular effort to question behind the German Emperor's back his assault on the English forces.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not know that I can question it behind his back. I hope it will be questioned in front of his face to such an extent that it will not succeed.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I meant no offense to the Senator by saying "behind his back." I was referring to the fact that behind the back of the invading lines of Germany there was no one questioning that course of action.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understood what the Senator said.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I did not mean that offensively to the Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I know that the Senator did not. I do not expect that the intervention of Japan in Russia would result in any formidable or increased movement of the Russian people against the allies. The Senator knows that Russia is now under the control of the Germans; and if he has read the multitude of dispatches which, all taken together, indicate the true situation, he knows that Germany's constant and persistent labor and work in Russia is to fasten her tentacles upon the resources of that country; and unless they are stopped by the only thing that appeals to those who direct the movement of the German armies—namely, force—we will have what the Senator fears, and that is the resources of the Russian Empire directed against the allies in this war.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit just one more interruption, I will not trouble him any more.

I will ask the Senate to think for just a moment of the vast stretch of country lying between the proposed assault by Japan and the great Russian Empire, of which Germany at the present time has but a drop in the bucket in her possession, and to consider whether an assault from the extreme opposite side by an alien race might not have the effect that I have suggested. Not knowing that it was the President's attitude, not standing in the light of defending his attitude in any way, but seeing the geography of the situation and the immense differences of opinion in the Russian Empire, so far as we can safely gather them, it seems to me that we might be a little timid before we say, and think very carefully before we say, to the Commander in Chief of the Armies of the United States: "We advise right now an assault on eastern Russia."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a suggestion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield.

Mr. KING. I agree with the able Senator in his observations respecting Japan, and her integrity, and her scrupulous regard of all obligations as an ally, and her desire to carry out her international responsibilities. I agree with him that there is no reason justifying anyone in expressing or entertaining a doubt as to the fidelity of Japan to the allies in this great contest. I think I can say to the Senator—and I make this observation after having made some investigation—that the subject concerning which he is now speaking, namely, the intervention of Japan in Siberia, has received and is receiving the most serious consideration of the executive department of the United States and of the allies.

I do not think that there is a concurrence of view upon the part of all the interested parties in the wisdom or necessity of a military expedition immediately by Japan into Siberia. It has not been determined yet, as I understand, that the military grounds demand or justify the sending of a Japanese army into Siberia. Of course, the situation changes almost daily, so that no absolutely immutable plan can be adopted. My information is that the stores of munitions and war supplies the Senator refers to are not imperilled by any attack, threatened or potential, now apparent upon the part of German or Austrian forces; and I think the Senator can be assured that just as soon as it becomes apparent that military exigencies demand the intervention of Japan in Siberia Japan will go into Siberia with the support of all of the allies, including the Government of the United States. I feel sure that the executive department of the Government is dealing with this serious and important matter in a broad and comprehensive way. It is not always an easy task to ascertain the facts with reference to a condition so far away as that now existing in Siberia and eastern Russia, and the uncertainty of a situation and the daily change therein renders the consideration of the same difficult and delicate.

In my opinion there will be concord between our Government and those associated with her against the central powers in dealing with the Far East situation.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, my only hope is that the decision will not be delayed until it is a repetition of being

too late, as has been so often the case in this war. The experiences in the war have indicated that the successful defense of what America stands for—free government, the principles of Christianity, and the teachings of civilization—must be defended in the west. From the beginning Russia has made but a feeble opposition, compared with her resources and numbers, to the central powers, which have started out to impose their "kultur" upon the world. The farther west we come, in my judgment from the experience of military operations of the war, the stauncher and stronger people are found. Austria perhaps is a little better than Russia; Germany is a little better than Austria; France and England are far superior to Germany; and when America finds herself, when her people are advised as to the issue, when we recover from the long campaign which was made by those in authority to prevent us from preparing to defend our rights, I am in hopes that we will, at least, be able to prove ourselves worthy to take our stand as equals beside those great people who are now defending civilization from the barbarism of Germany.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I have been sitting here in my seat wondering why this speech was made and this discussion had this morning. What is the purpose of it? Does anybody think it is going to do any good? I hope my friend was not playing politics when he was discussing these matters. I hope to God that is not true. This is no time to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is House bill 8696, the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I was much impressed, as I am sure we all were, by the remarks of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] a few moments ago. I agree with him, as I am sure the Senator from Washington will also, that this is no time to discourage the American people. But, Mr. President, while that is true, by the same token no more is it the time to mislead the people as to our condition of preparedness for the great task that is ahead of us.

In the course of some remarks that I addressed to the Senate yesterday I stated that I had recently seen in the public prints some statements which I regarded as perilously misleading. I do not withdraw the adjective. I think some of the statements I have seen are perilously misleading. For instance, on the 21st day of February there appeared in the Washington Post and in other newspapers a statement given out by the Secretary of War. The headlines over that article in the Post read as follows:

UNITED STATES AEROS GO ABROAD—FIRST SHIPMENT IS FIVE MONTHS AHEAD OF ORIGINAL SCHEDULE—LIBERTY MOTOR SETS PACE—MAKES POSSIBLE ATTACKS ON HUNS MUCH SOONER THAN EXPECTED—BREAKS EVERY KNOWN RECORD FOR SPEED AND CLIMBING OF THAT TYPE OF MOTORS FOR FLIERS, SECRETARY BAKER ANNOUNCES—THOUSANDS OF SKILLED MECHANICS NOW NEEDED AND MUST VOLUNTEER, NUMBER BEING 115,000.

Then the article begins with this:

The first American-built battle planes are en route to France, near five months ahead of the original schedule.

Mr. President, I am loath to believe that the Secretary of War gave out that statement. I can scarcely credit it as true, and yet it is attributed to him in this article and other newspapers of the same date.

Mr. President, I submit that that statement was wholly misleading and, as I said yesterday, perilously so. I mean by that just this: That any statement which leaves the American people under the impression that things are as they are not is perilously misleading. The people are entitled to know the truth. If we can not tell them the truth, let us not feed them upon statements of a kind which tend to quiet them and lessen their appreciation of the tremendous efforts that must be put forth by all, if we are to win this war.

Just 10 days ago there appeared in the newspapers a dispatch on the same subject, and the Indianapolis Star, a newspaper printed in the city in which I have my home, printed as headlines over this article:

"United States air fleet certain by July."

"Battle planes sufficient to protect all American sectors will then be in France."

The article which those headlines lead is not so very definite in what it has to say, but the impression made by the tenor of the dispatch upon the mind of the editor who wrote those headlines was in conformity with the character of the headlines themselves, and the whole American people are misled by that sort of thing, as they should not be.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. NEW. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator surely does not mean to hold the Secretary of War responsible for headlines in a newspaper or even for the contents of the newspaper article?

Mr. NEW. I did not. I said I was loath to believe that the Secretary of War had said what was attributed to him. The headlines, of course, are written in the office of the newspaper, but I read the first paragraph of it and I will read a little further:

The first American-built battle planes are en route to France, near five months ahead of the original schedule.

In making this announcement last night, Secretary Baker said the first shipment, although not large, "marks the final overcoming of many difficulties met in building up this new and intricate industry."

That is what the Secretary is quoted as having said.

Mr. President, I did not rise here for the purpose of criticizing the Secretary of War or of criticizing anybody else particularly, but I do think the point ought to be made clear that it is time the American people should be told the truth about their own affairs and not to be misled into a condition of mind that is too complacent considering the tremendous emergency with which we are brought face to face.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. NEW. I yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. I agree with the Senator that the public should be told the truth, and I assume therefore that the Senator will tell the truth now. Have we one single fighting airplane over in Europe to-day?

Mr. NEW. Not one.

Mr. McCUMBER. Have we a machine to-day, according to the testimony of experts, that will stand the strain of a fighting machine?

Mr. NEW. We have not a single combat plane in France to-day, unless it has been landed within the last few days.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. NEW. I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have, Mr. President, somewhat the same intention of the Senator who has just propounded his query. I am a very humble Member of this body, but, like every other Member here, I am willing to give of my blood just as you are ready to give of your blood; but we ask for the blood that we give a fair chance in fighting this war. I take it the Senator understands and knows just what the situation is, and therefore, with his permission, I want to ask him what was the aircraft program for July 1 of this year?

Mr. NEW. I think, while I had not intended to mention it, it is fair and just to say that the original program called for delivering in France 12,000 combat planes by the 1st of next July.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Then I ask the Senator if he can answer, and if the answer violates no confidence, how many were delivered or how many will this Government deliver on the 1st day of July in France?

Mr. NEW. Thirty-seven.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Indiana, I desire to ask concerning the accuracy of a startling statement which has been repeated all over this building to-day. Is it in testimony before the Military Committee that the condition of our boys in the trenches to-day is that without let or hindrance German planes are flying over them and flying so low that our boys are shooting at them with revolvers? I want to know whether that is the testimony before the Military Committee?

Mr. NEW. It is.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Then, Mr. President, in answer to the animadversions of the Senator from North Carolina and others, I say that there is just one way to correct this sort of outrage upon American youth, and that way is, in the language of a distinguished Executive, "pitiless publicity." [Applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is any further demonstration in the galleries the Chair will direct the Sergeant at Arms to clear the galleries. The occupants of the galleries must understand that they are here by the courtesy of the Senate, and that manifestations of approval or disapproval form an infraction of the rules.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. NEW. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator says that it is now expected that there will be 37 combat planes delivered in France in July. Certain statements that bear intrinsic evidence of being from a well-informed source that I called attention to

this morning make a distinction between aeroplanes which go under what I think is a misleading name of combat planes. He states that these planes that are called combat planes are listed alongside of another list that are called primary training planes and another list called advanced training planes; that the combat planes in that list are not fighting planes, but they are raiding and bombing planes; and there is still another list of battle planes which are the only ones that are supposed to engage in battle in the air with hostile airplanes. I should like to know if that is correct?

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, the Senator is correct. All planes, as I understand it, that are engaged in combat are designated combat planes. That includes the rapid flyer and the bombing plane. They are distinguished from the observation plane and the scout plane. When I refer to combat planes I include in that list all the different varieties that are used in actual combat—bomb dropping and attacking other planes, and all that sort of thing.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. NEW. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. In view of the answer of the Senator to the question of the Senator from California, I think it is fair to add to that statement that the original estimate of 12,000 machines was made last year, and that the estimate of February was about 2,100 or 2,200.

Mr. NEW. That is fair, because it is true.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. NEW. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. I suggest this thought also to the Senator: There has been a great deal said on the floor by distinguished Senators, members of the Military Affairs Committee, about drawing to the assistance of the national defense distinguished captains of industry, men who are known throughout the commercial and business world as successful business men. The demand has been made that such men ought to have been brought into the War Department, mobilizing the industries of the country and to better plan and outline and provide for this great national exigency. I suggest that the aircraft development has been largely in the hands of business men and not of military men. If I am mistaken the Senator will correct me.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I have not, up to this time at least, criticized the gentlemen who have had in charge the production of aircraft, but I have pleaded for a cessation of the making of misleading statements to the people of the United States and I have pleaded that they may know the truth about their own affairs.

There is no Senator on this floor who has any more abiding faith in the capacity of the American for great things than I have. I believe they can accomplish wonders once they set about it, once they know just what they have to do.

Mr. President, it is not calculated to make men go down into their pockets and subscribe for liberty loans, as we all must, if we are told that our airplane program is five months ahead of schedule, if we are told that everything is swimming, that all is just as it should be and all that could be asked. If they realize the truth, Mr. President, it will be far better for our soldiers who are abroad and far better for the cause they represent, and it is for that, Mr. President, that I plead.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course, it would not do the American people any good for the program to be five months ahead of the schedule if it was six months behind the war. I do not want to seem to be too persistent in asking the Senator a question. I wish to ask him one more question, because I think it is very important to ascertain, if possible, from the different sources of information the exact truth about this particular matter.

The distinguished Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] very graphically described in a few words and drew a picture of the situation of our young men in the battle trenches of France, and of German airplanes flying over those trenches with impunity so low that they shot at them with revolvers.

Mr. McCUMBER. The airplanes dropping gas bombs.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Dropping gas bombs on the trenches and in the rear of the trenches, on our camps, and in villages where our soldiers were living. If I understand the matter correctly, and I think I do, there is only one type, one class, I may say—there may be several types, but one class—of airplane that is capable of attacking the German planes that have been referred to that are doing the damage, and that class is not what is described as combat planes, which carry loads of bombs for raiding purposes, but small battle planes, intended for one purpose and one purpose only, and that is to

reach the enemy plane and to attack it and destroy it. It is called a battle plane.

I should like to ask the Senator, because he is unusually well informed and has the benefit of all the testimony that has been given before the Military Affairs Committee, how many, if any, of the 37 planes that will be ready in July, that magnificent accomplishment of 37 planes one year and three months after we have been engaged in the war, will be battle planes that will be capable of attacking these German planes and destroying them?

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I am afraid the Senator will credit me with more information than I have, because I am unable to answer that question definitely. I only know that we are to have in France on July 1 the number of fighting planes of all classes that I mentioned in answer to the question of the Senator from California a few moments ago.

REGISTRATION FOR MILITARY SERVICE.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I wish to ask the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs to lay aside temporarily the appropriation bill and take up Senate joint resolution 124 and let us finish that business to-day. I regard it as one of the most important measures that is going to come before the Senate. It is a war measure exclusively; it has been on the calendar nearly a month and a half, and it ought to be passed.

Mr. ASHURST. I share fully the view of the Senator from Arkansas. For that reason I did not insist that the unfinished business should be discussed during the morning hour, realizing that the Senate is a very efficient body of men, and that it can give a great answer in the hour of peril as to how to do business. I ask that the unfinished business be laid aside for 20 minutes that the joint resolution may be taken up and passed. Twenty minutes, I am sure, will be ample time.

Mr. KIRBY. Twenty minutes should be ample time to pass it in view of all the discussion that has preceded it this morning, but I doubt if that will be enough. I think it is of sufficient importance to displace anything on the calendar. I should like to have the Senator give an hour, and if it should not require an hour, then the appropriation bill could be taken up as soon as the joint resolution has been passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to say to the Senator from Arizona that I think the joint resolution is most important. It will require only a very short delay in the consideration of the appropriation bill, and I hope he will allow it to be taken up.

Mr. ASHURST. It is so important that I sit here in shocking amazement when Senators talk, talk, talk, when they ought to be voting. I ask that the unfinished business be laid aside for one hour and at the end of that hour, if it is not disposed of, I shall demand the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLIS in the chair). The Senator from Arizona asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside not to exceed one hour. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I am not going at this time to continue the discussion that we have had to-day. I think it is a discussion that will do a great deal of good in the country, and I believe it will do a great deal of good with those who are administering the affairs of the Government. I am going to discuss some phases of it on to-morrow at the first opportunity I may have. I would not object to laying aside the Indian appropriation bill if there is any assurance that the joint resolution will be passed, but we are simply wasting time by taking a short while in the discussion of one bill and then taking up the unfinished business. We will gain time if we will continue the unfinished business and finish it and then take up these other measures, unless we can pass the joint resolution in 15 or 20 minutes.

Mr. McKELLAR. We can pass it in five minutes, I will say to the Senator, if we just quit talking about it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is true. I am not going to discuss it, but I imagine that the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] will create considerable discussion. If there is any assurance that it will not lead to prolonged discussion, I will not object to laying aside the unfinished business.

Mr. McKELLAR. The joint resolution was discussed very thoroughly yesterday. I hope the Senator will not object to letting it come up. I think we can pass it in the course of an hour.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It was not discussed very long yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas that the unfinished business be laid aside for one hour in order that Senate joint resolution 124 may be considered?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 124) providing for the registration for military service of all male persons citizens of the United States or residing in the United States who have, since the 5th day of June, 1917, and on or before the day set for the registration by proclamation by the President, attained the age of 21 years, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe under the terms of the act approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. New].

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I desire briefly to oppose the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana. Here is a joint resolution which proposes to require the registration of all men who have become of age since the last day of registration that they may be drafted into the service in order that they may be mobilized into camps and trained to become soldiers at the end of the training period. It is regarded necessary that this shall be done. The War Department has long since asked that it be done; the Military Affairs Committee has recommended favorably the joint resolution, and now this amendment is proposed, which requires neither more nor less than that in addition to registering men who have come of age since the last draft, all men of 18 years of age shall be registered and trained as soldiers, but shall not be required to fight until after they become 21 years of age. That, it seems to me, will confuse the system we now have for organizing and mobilizing our Army. It will bring men into the training camps where we have no room to train them. It will bring them into training camps requiring an expenditure of money that we can not afford to spare from the training of the Regular Army. It will bring men into camp to be trained by officers who can not be taken away from the training of the regular soldiers. It will do all this. It will bring men in and mobilize them and expend money on them to the exclusion of soldiers when they can not be put into the battle line after the training is finished.

We are in war. We need more men. The imperative need of the allies yonder to-day is for more soldiers equipped and trained. England has asked for 250,000. We have not sent them yet. Now, what we want is soldiers who when trained can be put into the fighting front.

The joint resolution ought to be passed without any sort of universal-training theory attached to it. When the war is finished, in my opinion, there will be 10,000,000 men in the United States who will have been trained effectively, and 3,000,000 of them will have fought across the sea. That is the sort of Army you will have in the United States when the war is over if it is brought to a successful conclusion, and I believe it will be.

Now, why do you want to talk about universal training under those circumstances? There will be time then to talk about training men who can not be used now. Then, let us cut this amendment off, let us take it out now and pass the joint resolution.

I am not going to discuss the general situation here. There have been some very disquieting declarations made, but I want to say for the benefit of the public that there have been misstatements or rather inaccurate statements made here this morning. I am not able to state the condition accurately about some of the matters. But we have fighting planes on the American front in France. They are not American made; no. We have no battle planes which are American made on the American front in France, but we have contracted with France to supply the fighting planes over there, and we are furnishing the raw materials in order that it may be done. We have enough, as I understand, now to protect the fighting front yonder in France. That is the condition on that point, but it is true, as a matter of imperative need—

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. KIRBY. I yield.

Mr. KELLOGG. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas if he heard Gen. Wood's testimony on yesterday?

Mr. KIRBY. I heard Gen. Wood's testimony, and if you should ask me my private opinion about it I would give you such an answer as I would not like to make before the Senate here, and it would not be—well, I will not say, because Gen. Wood was urged to make some of the statements that he did.

Mr. KELLOGG. I desire to ask the Senator from Arkansas if Gen. Wood did not testify that the soldiers on the front were unprotected by airplanes?

Mr. KIRBY. I did not so understand him. He said the soldiers were well fed; that they were in good health and in

fine spirits; that they were as capable a body of soldiers as there were in the world; and that man for man they were excelled by none. He also said there were no American big guns over there, but we knew that. We bought our big guns from France. We bought our fighting planes from France. They are there, and I did not understand Gen. Wood to deny it. I do not care to go into that, although I have my own view about what Gen. Wood said before the committee on yesterday, and if it becomes necessary later on I shall give expression to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. New].

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the proposed amendment it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided further, That the period of training between the ages of 19 and 21 years shall be in the aggregate not less than six months.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, just a word in regard to this proposed amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana. Reading the amendment of the Senator from Indiana, it simply provides:

That all registered male persons who have attained the age of 19 years shall be subject to military training in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the President but shall not be called for active service until they have attained the age of 21 years.

Mr. President, I see no necessity for that great Executive discretion in the matter of military training during the period of two years between the ages of 18 and 21. Under the provisions of the amendment of the Senator from Indiana a period of 24 hours might be prescribed as the period for military training or a period of one year might be prescribed as the period of military training. It is left absolutely in the discretion of the President as to the time of the military training for these two years.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. STERLING. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I imagine that the reason for that is because this joint resolution, if the two classes of men—those 19 and 20—were put into actual training all the time, would withdraw from the industrial and the agricultural world 2,000,000 of our young men, or the greater portion of 2,000,000 of our young men. It seems to me that there ought to be limitations, and I have expressed that view to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. New]; but, after all, his idea about the matter, it seems to me upon reflection, is correct, because it is going to be a very serious thing to withdraw 2,000,000, or thereabouts, of young men from the commercial and industrial and agricultural systems of the country. It ought to be left to regulation, so that those young men can be trained in those portions of the year which will take them away the smallest amount of time from industry, agriculture, and commerce, which are so necessary to be carried on in this country at this time.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I will simply say, in answer to the Senator from Tennessee, that the period of military training in order to equip these men for efficient service ought not to be less than six months; and that is the period provided for in the original Chamberlain bill, the bill which is now known as Senate bill No. 1—a period of training for six months during the year in which the young man becomes 19 year of age—but here now are two years and no period of training provided for, but all is left in the discretion of the President.

It occurs to me that the industries of the country might be protected with six months' training within that period of two years, and that men might be taken for two months or three months of the time, as the case might be, and that, too, when there would be the least prejudice to the various industries from which they are taken.

The object is to prescribe a period of military training and to provide that there shall be during the two years at least six months of such training.

Mr. VARDAMAN and Mr. NEW addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. STERLING. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. May I suggest to the Senator from South Dakota that if the services of these boys are to be used in this war, he need have no fear, without his amendment, of their being subjected to less than six months' training, because six months' training is absolutely necessary if they are to be prepared to perform the duties of a soldier when they reach their

majority and become subject to the present law. I do not think the amendment is at all necessary, even to carry out the honorable Senator's purposes.

If the Senator will indulge me further, I desire to say that I am going to vote against the amendment of the Senator from Indiana, even if it should be amended by the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota, because I really think that under the present law we can raise more men than we shall have ships to carry across the waters within the next two years, and I am fully mindful of the disastrous consequences which will follow taking these men from the industrial walks of life. If this war shall be won by the allies, it will be won by the combined use of bread and bullets. It is impossible to have sufficient food and clothing for our people at home, our soldiers and allies across the seas, unless the lands are cultivated, and the lands can not be cultivated without man power to do it. Every one of these boys is needed in industrial pursuits very much more than they are needed to use the gun. I am afraid that in the excitement of the moment, caused by the desperate conflict going on in Europe at this time, that we are liable to do imprudent and unwise things. There is no difference of purpose between the proponents of this amendment and myself on the ends to be reached; the difference is only in the means to the end.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. STERLING. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered was drawn in the form in which it now appears before the Senate with the thought that the President, in calling these young men, would have in mind the requirements of the callings in which they may be engaged, so far as they are engaged in any calling; that where they are students they might be taken at a time of the year when their colleges and schools were not in session; that as farmer boys they might be taken at the time of the year when the planting and harvesting seasons were not on; and that, if they were in other callings, they might be taken at the time of the year when they might be best spared from those callings whatever they may be.

I agree with what the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] has just stated to the effect—because that was the effect of it—that a period of less than six months' training—an aggregate of that much—in the two years covered would not amount to any training at all. I am therefore perfectly willing to accept the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I desire to ask the Senator from Indiana a question. The life of this joint resolution, and therefore of the amendment, as I understand, is limited to the term of the war, is it not?

Mr. NEW. It is; yes.

Mr. HENDERSON and Mr. KELLOGG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized; but before the Senator proceeds the Chair desires to state that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] has accepted the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] to his amendment. Therefore the pending question is on the amendment of the Senator from Indiana as modified.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. President, during the early stages of the war press and periodical earnestly and seriously printed columns on "Will the West fight?" While the West has shown that it will fight, in view of what has been said here this morning, I wish to read a short but a very interesting statement, which has been issued by the adjutant general of Nevada, indicating in the highest degree just what the West has done, and particularly that the West is back of the President in his great work almost to a man, and when I say that I include the western women. The statement to which I refer reads as follows:

NEVADA HEADS STATES IN PERCENTAGE OF VOLUNTEERS FOR ARMY.

CARSON CITY, NEV., March 14, 1918.

Figures received by Adj. Gen. Maurice J. Sullivan from The Adjutant General of the Army, Washington, D. C., show that Nevada's patriotism, as reflected by volunteer enlistments for the Regular Army, is the highest of any State in the Union. Nevada has gone "over the top" 900 per cent in the quota of enlistments called for, her volunteers from April 1, 1917, to February 26, 1918, reaching a total of 1,447, as against a required quota of 162.

Western States make a much better showing than any other section of the country, with Nevada standing at the head of the list, giving to the Nation nine times the number of volunteers called for by the Government as her proportion for the Regular Army, and followed in sequence by Montana, at 758.78 per cent; Utah, at 516.09; Oregon, at 472.10; Wyoming, at 432.41; Idaho, at 360.92; Washington, at 352.80; and California, at 337.57.

Nevada's record in volunteers is in keeping with her performance in every other call upon her patriotism and resources in the present world crisis, as it was her proud distinction to be the first State to oversubscribe its quota on the first liberty loan, narrowly missing making the same record on the second loan; and in Red Cross and other contributions and activities pertaining to the war Nevada loyally and zealously bears her banner of the "Battle-born State" at the very head of the procession of patriotic Commonwealths.

The average percentage of the volunteer enlistments compared to the specified quota for each State, based upon the official figures received by Adj. Gen. Sullivan, is 207.16 per cent. Nevada, therefore, heading the list at 893.21 per cent, is 696.05 per cent above the average for all of the States.

Mr. President, I have read this statement for the purpose of showing the patriotic spirit which has been manifested throughout the western portion of the United States, and particularly as showing how enthusiastically, and almost unanimously, the President has the support of that section in the great work in which he is now engaged. I believe that the figures which I have presented show that the West is most heartily in accord with the sentiment which has been expressed by our President, and I heartily approve of the principle which is involved in and covered by this joint resolution.

I can say, I believe without contradiction, that there are no better soldiers in our ranks than those that come from the great West. I am here to legislate for their comfort and welfare, as well as the comfort and welfare of all our soldiers and fighting men. I am here to assist our President in the work that confronts him at this critical time. It seems to me to be wise legislation to increase our fighting force and provide for the needs and requirements of our Army with all the speed that is in us.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I shall take but a moment of the time of the Senate, but I should like to express my views and reasons for voting for the amendment of the Senator from Indiana. To my mind, it is one of the most important pieces of legislation that has come before the Senate since I have been a Member of it. It proposes a military and economic principle far-reaching in its effects and of surpassing importance.

Will we not be warned by the experience of England, a democracy which, like ourselves, for years labored under the delusion that the ocean and the channel were her protection; that her navy was all that was necessary? A standing army was deemed to be a danger to the English nation rather than a protection. Had England had a million men trained as soldiers, the war would not have occurred. They would have been an insurance for the peace of Europe. England has paid dearly for her folly—the loss of a million men, the shaking of the foundations of the British Empire, and possibly the loss of her colonies. We are not interested, perhaps, in the extension of that dynasty, but we are interested in the principles of Anglo-Saxon government and civilization which she has spread over the world.

Mr. President, I am not going to revert to the failures and the follies of the last year; I shall look forward. I realize that before we entered the war, since Germany was confined at least upon the east within her natural boundaries and only occupied a part of France and Belgium, it was difficult to make the American people believe in world domination of Prussian militarism; but to-day it is different. With Germany occupying all or nearly all of Russia, the Balkan Peninsula, a part of Italy, and making the most tremendous efforts to break through the English and French lines and complete the destruction of France, German world domination is not so remote, perhaps, as we may imagine; and we may have to answer at the bar of history for our failure to prepare. Is there a better time to do it than now?

Sir, I fear we do not realize what Prussian slavery means. If we could but hear the sobs of Belgium, see the ravishing of Serbia, know the crimes against Poland, and bring them home to our people, I think we might realize what some day we may be confronted with. The Hun has not changed in 2,000 years. Civilization may have sharpened his lust for conquest and power, and knowledge and science increased his instruments of destruction, but he is a Hun at heart, and he is seeking the domination of the world by the most brutal and barbaric methods ever employed. We might just as well understand that now as at any other time.

If the war continues, as it may, for two or three years, the highest military authorities say we may need two and a half million or three million men in France. Gen. Wood says we may; and I consider him one of the highest military authorities. It is better to procure those men through universal military training than in any other way. Such training has many advantages; it is democratic. I call as a witness the same distinguished general when he says that the American drafted Army, made for man, is the finest army in the world, better by far than the old

Regular Army of this country, and that was a fine Army. It is economical because the youth can receive his training with his education. Moreover, it engenders patriotism and love of country, inspires a feeling of responsibility, and augments his interest in his country. It improves health and morals.

If you will but look at the thousands of spindleg-legged, narrow-chested, weak-hearted young men who have been discharged or not taken because physically unfit, you will know that the Nation needs universal military training. That training will make vigorous, strong men; and when they go back to the employments of civil life, after undergoing military training, they will be better qualified for the struggle of life than would otherwise be the case.

But, say the pacifists, it inspires war. I deny it. Look at Switzerland. She has not been engaged in war since the Napoleonic wars, although she is in the midst of the troubled nations of Europe. She has always had universal military training. It could not inspire war under our form of government. Our form of government is a protection against Prussian militarism or any other. A soldier is a citizen with the same interest in his country, with the same interest in his home, with the same interest in peaceful occupations. I never knew a private soldier to desire war for the glory of it. We have but to look at the millions of men who constituted the armies of the North and the South at the close of the rebellion, who returned to their occupations and their homes better citizens, and loving peace more than before, but with a feeling of responsibility born of the knowledge that they had done something for their mother country.

We may say—and we deluded ourselves at one time with the thought—that the age of war has passed. Peace societies were formed, Hague conventions organized, and all the literature of peace was spread over the world; and yet in an instant, in an age of peace and civilization, a war has descended upon the world the horrors of which surpass barbarism. All history gives the lie to the statement that war has ceased. From the time the first and greatest Republic known to history was struggling against the efforts of oriental power to the dawn of the twentieth century the troubled pathway of progress and civilization has been lined with the wrecks of war. It was war that brought democracy to France; it was war that insured the liberty and the institutions of the Anglo-Saxon; it was war that brought to this country the establishment of the principles of freedom, and in time it may be, and probably will be, necessary to fight for the preservation of this Nation. A government that is worth having is worth fighting for.

If we reserve this measure until after the war we shall never pass it. Now is the time to prepare for the future, when we are confronted with the greatest crisis the Nation has ever known or may ever know. I hope that the amendment will be agreed to and that the joint resolution will pass.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I have for many years been in favor of universal military training. It develops physical manhood for both peace and war. I have, however, serious doubts as to the advisability of attaching to this emergency measure the amendment of the junior Senator from Indiana. We have already provided for a larger Army than we have thus far been able to equip, and we have millions of men of legal age already on the registered list ready to be called. We do not need these boys below the age of 21 for this war. We are in the midst of a great emergency, which is not only military but industrial, and one quite as much as the other. To me it would seem a most unwise thing for the country at this time to take a million and a half or two million or three million of the boys who are needed for the industrial life of the Nation, who are quite as much needed in peaceful pursuits to preserve the Nation as is the Army or the Navy, and compel them to go into training camps. Not only that, but I am thinking somewhat of the expense that this plan is going to charge upon the country. If, however, I thought this amendment could be beneficial in winning the war, I would not hesitate to support it, but I do not believe that it can be utilized to promote the successful prosecution of the war. On the contrary, I can conceive how it may retard the victory. We have already called for the Army and Navy about 2,000,000 men between 21 and 30 years of age, and that has made a tremendous drain upon the industrial support of the Nation. The agricultural interests of this country are in jeopardy to-day, and they being in danger the result of the war itself is threatened. I believe it would be very unwise at a time when food shortage is threatened for lack of farm labor to increase that danger by taking unnecessarily more men from the pursuit of agriculture to train them for an emergency beyond the present war. Our business is to win this war. Whatever is necessary to that

end should be—must be—employed, but no unnecessary burden should be carried.

I admit the force of all the arguments that have been made in favor of the principle of universal military training. In ordinary times I am in favor of it; I have stood for it; I wanted to adopt it four years ago; but we have now made our plans for this war; we are drafting our resources almost to the limit; and we are really placing in danger the production of the food that is necessary for ourselves and our allies. Now, you propose to force a system of universal training, which shall take not less than a million and a half, and probably more, of our boys who are needed to carry on the work of the country, to train them for not less than six months in two years, while their fathers and brothers are already in the military camps. Every man, woman, and child in the United States has a duty to perform. Those of military age who are physically fit should enter the Army or Navy in either their active or reserve departments. The balance, and it will require all of them, should help to win the war by performing the agricultural and industrial work of the Nation.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, if we take the boys off the farm for six months of the year, so far as the farm is concerned we had just as well take them for 12 months.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think so. To take these men, who are now needed to balance up our program, out of all productive activity for six months seems to me the height of folly, and that notwithstanding, as I have already said, I am in favor of universal military training.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield.

Mr. KELLOGG. Does not the provision of the amendment making them subject to military training under rules and regulations prescribed by the President safeguard that matter?

Mr. TOWNSEND. The original amendment did that; but the Senator from Indiana has accepted the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], which compels the President to take them for six months out of two years.

Mr. KELLOGG. I was not aware of that.

Mr. TOWNSEND. It is a compulsory proposition now. It might have been better if it had been left as the Senator introduced it, although, as has been suggested by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], the President might impose 12 months' training, but I do not think he would. If it is left in the discretion of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, with this crisis on our hands, I do not believe he would compel them for six months or three months during the pendency of this war to leave the works that are necessary for the country to engage in this particular training plan.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I did not mean, by my suggestion, to convey the idea that the President would enforce 12 months' training without the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota, because I, like the Senator, do not believe he would. Probably he would not make it less than six months. But, in addition to the reasons which the Senator has given, is it not fair to say that when we do, if we do, provide for universal military training, Congress ought as a matter of fact to enact and put into the statutes the definite time that soldiers should be trained—in other words, not turn it all over to the President? We might have one President who would want to train them 6 months, and the next President might want to train them 30 days. In other words, when we do enact such a law, ought we not to make it comprehensive, so that it would be a definite statute?

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President—

Mr. TOWNSEND. Just let me answer the question of the Senator from Nebraska, and then I will yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. Certainly.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I answer the Senator from Nebraska by stating, as I began, that this is emergency legislation. It is proposed to put an amendment on the measure without proper consideration.

Mr. NORRIS. Exactly.

Mr. TOWNSEND. We are proposing to write into a war statute—that is, limited to the period of the war—this universal military training proposition, without having considered it in all of its details and relations to all of the matters involved in this war.

Mr. WATSON, Mr. STERLING, and Mr. SHERMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. I simply desired to ask this question of the Senator from Nebraska: Does the Senator understand that this is the permanent policy of the Government, as announced in this amendment, or is not this only a temporary measure, for the duration of this war?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I shall be glad to allow the Senator from Nebraska to answer the question.

Mr. NORRIS. My understanding is that this amendment is the announcement of a permanent policy.

Mr. WATSON. I had not so understood it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The act itself, of course, is temporary; but there could be no argument for this amendment except as a permanent measure—

Mr. NORRIS. That is right.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Because it can not be used during this war, if it ends, as many people think the war will end, in two or three years. It must be urged because of its effect upon the future, which I think would be a good effect and justifiable, if it did not cost too much now. If it did not interfere with the war now, I should say it was a good time to adopt it; the earlier the better.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield right there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. The amendment itself provides that it shall be a permanent policy, as I understand it. It says:

That in addition to the persons subject to registration and selective draft under the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917, all male persons between the ages of 19 and 30, both inclusive, shall be subject to registration and draft in accordance with the provisions of said act: *Provided*, That all registered male persons who have attained the age of 19 years shall be subject to military training in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the President, but shall not be called for active service until they have attained the age of 21 years.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I understood from the author of the amendment that he intended it to be limited to the period of the war.

Mr. WATSON, Mr. STERLING, and Mr. BORAH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield, and if so to whom? There are three Senators on their feet.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. This amendment provides that in addition to the persons at present subject to registration and selective draft, these others shall be added. Now, the provision for registration and for selective draft is only for the duration of the war.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Then, do I understand that this is simply another form of draft for the war?

Mr. NEW and Mr. NORRIS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield to the junior Senator from Indiana to answer that question.

Mr. NEW. Is that inquiry addressed to me? I did not get the inquiry of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I understood from the remarks of the Senator's colleague that this was only a temporary war emergency that was being provided for.

Mr. NEW. The whole act is temporary in its application.

Mr. BORAH. Then do I understand that the Senator is simply offering an amendment here that would be considered a war measure, to end with the war?

Mr. NEW. I think it is a war measure.

Mr. BORAH. And to end with the war?

Mr. NEW. No.

Mr. BORAH. That is precisely what I was seeking to ascertain.

Mr. NORRIS. That is what I was getting at, too.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I understood the Senator from Indiana [Mr. New] to answer the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Vardaman] a few minutes ago and say that it was.

Mr. NEW. I think it would end with the war, because the whole act is limited to the duration of the war.

Mr. BORAH. But the Senator's intention is to inaugurate and initiate a permanent policy of universal military training?

Mr. NEW. That would be the Senator's desire.

Mr. BORAH. Is that the Senator's intention with this amendment?

Mr. NEW. To inaugurate it, in the hope that Congress will continue it.

Mr. WATSON. That is the point precisely.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. STERLING. I thought the Senator had yielded the floor.

Mr. TOWNSEND. No.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, a moment ago I addressed an interrogatory to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. New] as to the life of this amendment. His answer was that it was limited to the period of the war. Now, I do not understand the Senator to say that his amendment extends beyond the war, do I?

Mr. NEW. No; I do not think the act at all, any part of it, extends beyond the war; but I say I am offering it now in the hope that Congress will continue it and make it ultimately a permanent policy.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I trust I may be permitted to indulge the hope that it will not, after this war is over.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I would like to see universal military training after the war is over. I would have liked to have seen it before we entered the war; but with the preparations that we have already made, with 10,000,000 men registered for Army and Navy service and subject to call, with the conditions which surround us now, I think it would be a great mistake to divide and weaken our resources by putting in force a proposition that can not with any reason be expected to be of any avail to us during the war, but which may result in great embarrassment to us. I want universal military training to be discussed and settled upon its merits and not confined to an hour's discussion upon an emergency piece of war legislation. The proposition involved in the pending amendment is right in principle and in time of peace, but when our country is in war, when every able-bodied man is subject to call to the colors, when farms and factories and shops and mines are being denuded of men, when all the camps we can build and equip for our soldiers and recruits are already overcrowded, when the Public Treasury is carrying a load of almost crushing weight it is a poor time to force our boys into military-training schools unless such a thing is necessary to win this war. At any rate, let us take time to consider the matter.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I presume it is useless, but I most sincerely wish the Senator from Indiana [Mr. New] would withdraw this amendment and let us proceed with this joint resolution. It is a very important measure. Everything is depending now upon this legislation. We ought to go on with it and we ought to complete it. We have not an unforgiving minute to lose, and this proposition does not affect the conduct of this war. It does not reach the present conditions at all. Under the very provisions of the amendment the boys who are brought into training must continue this training for two years before they can register and be available as part of the Army. This war, in all probability, will end very much within that time. In fact, my own judgment is that the story will be told within the next six months; and this amendment does not bear one particle upon the conduct of the present war, inasmuch as it does not make available a single man, it does not train a single man that can be used in this war.

These boys from 19 to 21 are brought into compulsory training and they can not register until they are 21. It simply hampers the present arrangement. It puts an additional burden upon the country to train boys who can not be used for two years. Now, that thing can wait. It will be just as much in order and just as efficacious and just as wise, if we decide to do it at all, six months from now or a year from now as to-day. It will have just as much bearing on this war, except that if we do not adopt the amendment it will relieve us of the necessity of providing for this training which we shall be compelled to undertake if the amendment is adopted.

I wish the Senator from Indiana could see his way clear to let us pass this joint resolution, which provides for the registration of these men, and complete the call. They ought to be registered at once, as provided in this joint resolution. We now have something like 300,000 men, in round numbers, in the Navy, something like 400,000 men in the Regular Army, and

something like 700,000 men in the National Army, with 2,000,000 now waiting for call. You now propose to provide by this amendment that a million or a million and a half boys shall be taken out of the industries, out of the farms, and elsewhere, not less than six months every year and trained in order that two years from now they may be registered and become a part of the Army.

There is no use to bother with this now. It does deal with a permanent policy of the Government. It is a policy which can be settled and determined, as I said, a year from now just as well as now, and there is no occasion for insisting upon this amendment on this joint resolution, which is highly important that we should enact this day.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, that is just exactly one of the troubles with us in this country—"the war will probably end so-and-so." We hope that the war may not last more than six months, never taking into the account the other probability that it may last more than two years; that it may last indefinitely; and that our ultimate resources may be called upon to enable us to prosecute it to a successful conclusion.

As to these boys—

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. NEW. I yield.

Mr. KIRBY. Is it not a fact that under the amendment proposed here to-day we bring in practically a million new men every year? There are coming of age every year a million men who will be registered under this joint resolution that we propose to pass now.

Mr. NEW. There are about 500,000 men, physically fit, who would pass muster in the draft, becoming of age each year, according to the best information I can get. But, Mr. President, as to the argument made here that it is going to take these men for two years away from service, that assumes that every one of them is to-day only 19 years of age. Why, they are all the way from 19 up to 21 now. There are as many of them between 20 and 21 as there are between 19 and 20, and not all of them will have to wait two years; but every one of them is liable to service under this draft the minute he reaches the age of 21.

I contend that it is far better to begin on those men who are soon to be called and put them through a course of training that will make them available for use as soldiers when they have reached the age of 21 than it is to wait until they have reached that age, then put them into the Army, and require the time that is necessary to make a soldier of a man after he reaches that age.

Mr. SHERMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WALSH. Has the hour elapsed which was allotted for the discussion of this measure?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not until 25 minutes past 3. There is still 10 minutes remaining for the consideration of the joint resolution under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is an abundance of time for the present occupant of the floor.

Mr. President, why delude ourselves by mistaking hopes for conditions? The footfalls of destiny are 3,000 miles away. When the Secretary of War returns to his native soil I trust that by the light of bursting shells and the roar of German cannon he will have ceased in his heart to be a pacifist. I ask leave to insert in the RECORD, without reading, from his report under date of November 20, 1917, on page 36, the paragraph relating to universal military training.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING.

The subject of universal military training continues to be discussed in the country. The department has not sought and does not now seek legislation on the subject, chiefly for the reason that the formulation of a permanent military policy will inevitably be affected by the arrangements consequent upon the termination of the present war. Civilized men must hope that the future has in store a relief from the burden of armament and the destruction and waste of war. However vain that hope may appear in the midst of the most devastating and destructive war in the history of the race, it persists—perhaps because we are encouraged by the analogous substitution of courts for force in the settlement of private controversies; perhaps because all the perfections of nature teach us that they are the product of processes which have eliminated waste and substituted constructive for destructive principles. When a permanent military policy, therefore, comes to be adopted it will doubtless be conceived in a spirit which will be adequate to preserve against any possible

attack those vital principles of liberty upon which democratic institutions are based, and yet be so restrained as in no event to foster the growth of mere militarist ambitions or to excite the apprehension of nations with whom it is our first desire to live in harmonious and just accord.

Mr. SHERMAN. I trust, if in the providence of God the Secretary of War shall survive to write another report for 1918, this paragraph will not be found in it; or, if any be found in it upon that subject, that it will be in accord with the opinion of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. For some years I have seen him stand upon the floor of this Chamber, in season and out of season, when there was but little sympathy with his views, and when the piping times of peace were in the land, asking for universal military training. His appeal has fallen upon heedless ears.

To-day, whether we will it or not, Mr. President, we must face the conditions of the world. The German now is like he was 2,000 years ago. He is animated by the desire for world-wide conquest; and he is not other or different than in the days of Julius Caesar, when he hung upon the flank of the Roman. The face of the general who is on the front against the lingering remnant of American troops found across the ocean is the face of the German who destroyed civilization and left a refuge for it only in the church and the monasteries of an ancient age. He is the one survivor of the Dark Ages, because the civilized portion of mankind at that time, because of their vices, had not strength enough to defend themselves.

The civilized world to-day is not in that condition, but it is in a condition of lamentable unpreparedness. Since Strasburg and Sedan, and since the ancestor of the present Kaiser began his preparations for the military conquest of the world, the rest of us have slumbered under the delusions of universal peace. It will not come in my lifetime. I am prepared to pay war taxes the rest of my days. It is with a feeling of sadness that I realize that in my generation we will not see our hopes accomplished. I only hope to leave to the new generation a world that may conquer at least this power that has undertaken to spread its dominion around the globe.

I am in complete accord with this amendment, only if there is a question about its permanence I trust it will become the permanent policy of this country. If we do not prepare to defend by force republican government in the New World, we may confidently expect that we will be unable to preserve the Government founded by our fathers. To us, the principal Republic in the world, comes the sober responsibility to defend by brute force its right to survive.

This is no war for novices. It is a war against a military power that for 40 years, as I have suggested, has prepared to dominate the world. The senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] expressed the situation in language that ought to remain in the memory of every Senator. It is a contest between these two forms of government; and whether we wish it or not, we face the issue. There is no essential difference between Russian socialism and Prussian despotism. They both arrive at the same end. The poet Goethe, and in his time Heine, the German poet, described the Prussian of their generation as he is to-day. Both those poets, speaking for the better genius of the German people, said: "The Prussian is made by nature stupid and cruel, and by science he is made ferocious, wicked, and dangerous." The latter is the foe we face.

I believe Hindenburg foresaw the condition when he said: "The west line of our battle is not in France, but on the Atlantic coast of America." I hope the war will end in six months, or less time—who does not? But I refuse to be deluded by my hopes that it may be accomplished.

So far as I have a vote or can be heard on the floor of this Chamber I propose to put this country into a condition of defense. It is time we trained soldiers from the years of understanding until they reach the age when they can become full-fledged military men to meet the power across the sea. If we do not, this Republic never faced the crisis that it does now. The way we must prepare is by military force to meet the power that has humbled England, France, and their allies. Whatever we may think, however hopeful we may be, we can not close our ears nor our understanding to what has happened in the Old World.

The age of universal military training is at hand. Whether by our fiat to-day or by these amendments it can be accomplished avails but little. It is bound to come if we are to preserve ourselves against the power with which we are now at war.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I do not care to go on if the unfinished business is about to be laid before the Senate. I understand that the hour has expired now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will expire in about a minute.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee if he is going to ask to have the unfinished business laid aside still further?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, of course, when I asked unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside for one hour I had no doubt that a body of patriotic American Senators would dispose of this joint resolution within the hour. If it can be disposed of in the next 10 minutes, as I think it ought to be, I will ask unanimous consent that that be done.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I have no desire to delay the consideration of the joint resolution which is now pending, but I look upon this amendment as presenting a very serious proposition at this particular juncture. I am very much opposed to the amendment, and I shall want some time to present my views as to why I am opposed to it. It can not be disposed of in the next 10 minutes.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent agreement having expired, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, the Indian appropriation bill.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8696) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I was going to speak on the amendment that was pending when the joint resolution was up. I have no desire to speak on the Indian appropriation bill. If the Senator does not expect to lay aside the unfinished business, I will yield the floor.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, though a member of the Indian Affairs Committee, I was unfortunately absent at the time the bill under consideration was before it; but I desire to say a few words upon the item now before the Senate, notwithstanding the very complete presentation of the merits of the question by my colleague [Mr. MYERS] on yesterday.

I desire to preface what I have to say by some brief observations prompted by some inquiries addressed on yesterday to my colleague by the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. He has always evinced a very keen and sympathetic interest in these questions that are of primary concern to the people of the West. The inquiries naturally suggested that in the opinion of the Senator from New Hampshire the appropriation, while nominally for the improvement of the lands of the Indians and for the irrigation of their allotments, really operated practically exclusively for the benefit of the white settlers.

I am sure that the Senator from New Hampshire, if fully advised of the facts, would not recognize in that fact, even if it were true, any valid objection to the appropriation under consideration; and I take a little time to advise him and other Senators who may entertain like views why that is the case.

Under the bill by which this reservation was opened the Indians residing upon it were entitled to select their allotments, which they did. The remaining lands then became open to homestead entry, provision being made in the bill for the irrigation of a considerable area of the land thus opened to homestead settlement. The Reclamation Service outlined an extensive, and I may say, an ambitious plan for the irrigation of these lands. The plan was outlined even before the Indian allotments were selected, so that the Indians in selecting their allotments had an opportunity to select lands which would eventually be irrigated by the project which was contemplated by the bill. The white settler had an equal opportunity to select lands under the ditch that could be irrigated by the system or he had an opportunity to select lands above. Before the lands were opened to homestead entry at all they were appraised. Obviously the lands under the ditch and capable of irrigation from the canal to be constructed were valued at a comparatively high figure relatively, while the lands above the ditch, those that could not be irrigated by it, those that must be cultivated by the dry-farming system, if they are to be cultivated at all, were estimated at a relatively low figure.

Likewise, Mr. President, the homestead entryman was permitted to take only a single unit under the ditch, a limited area, in some cases 40 acres, but not to exceed 80 acres. The homestead entryman was invited by the Government to go

upon this area and select lands as he saw fit, either under the ditch or above the ditch. He was required to comply with all the requirements of the homestead law and to pay into the Treasury of the United States for the benefit of the Indians the appraised value of the land.

Accordingly settlers went there. Each settler had an opportunity to select lands under the ditch that were to be irrigated by the system or to select lands above the ditch. Vast numbers of them selected lands under the ditch upon the assurance given by the Government that in due and reasonable time the irrigation system would be completed and their lands would be thus opened to irrigation. The Government carried out that project, making, however, small appropriations, comparatively speaking, until last year, when an appropriation of \$750,000 was made.

Now, let me call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire and others who do me the honor to listen to this discussion to this, that up to the present time of the 134,500 acres under the ditch it is estimated that by July 1, 1918, with the aid of the large appropriation that was made last year, there will be opened to irrigation under the ditch 97,300 acres, leaving 37,200 acres under the ditch capable of irrigation by the system, when it is completed, now after nine years still without water.

The Senator will, I think, readily understand, and it can be very readily appreciated, that the man who made the selection of land under the ditch and has not yet been able to get water is in a most desperate situation. I undertake to say that if the Senator himself had gone out there and had exercised his homestead right and had taken 80 acres under that ditch, and had made all his preparations for farming, by irrigation rather than by the dry-farming system, not yet, after the lapse of nine years, being able to get water for his farm, he would appreciate the situation of many of those people.

So, Mr. President, I say it is a matter of no consequence how much of this land is being farmed by Indians. I will say with the greatest frankness here in the Senate that the expectations that were generously indulged at the time this project was started, and which had been harbored for many years before, that the Indians could be taught the use of water for irrigation and taught the arts of agriculture, and that they would use the water for that purpose have been most disappointingly met.

The fact about the matter is that there is only a very small proportion of the Indian allotments that are actually cultivated by the Indians themselves. Many of them, however, get the benefit of the irrigation by leasing their lands to white men who do cultivate the allotments. I undertake to say that there is not a full-blooded Indian upon the Flathead Reservation who actually makes use of the water for the purpose of irrigation. There are probably 1,000 acres cultivated by irrigation by breeds of various degrees of blood. However, there are still a large number of the Indians whose lands are included in this area of 37,200 acres that have not yet been supplied with water, and the appropriation is for the purpose of constructing laterals and extensions of the system in order that they may be supplied with water. They practically went there under an assurance from the Government carried in the legislation that in due course of time and with reasonable rapidity the water would be supplied to these lands, and they paid their money for the lands, and the money is in the Treasury of the United States upon practically that assurance and guaranty.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENDRICK in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Can the Senator tell the Senate whether or not the entire appropriation of last year has been exhausted, or is there a large surplus still in the hands of these parties?

Mr. WALSH. I am not able to give that information.

Mr. GALLINGER. One other question. Can the Senator give the Senate any idea, judging from the number of acres that have been irrigated under the appropriation of \$750,000, how much more money will be required to irrigate the lands that are now not irrigated?

Mr. WALSH. I can help the Senator with that. It was estimated that the appropriation of last year would extend the irrigated area by 17,300 acres. It would take two appropriations of that amount practically to cover the unirrigated area; that is, assuming that the same area would be covered by the additional appropriation.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is precisely the information that I wanted to get. An appropriation of \$750,000 this year and of an equal amount next year would almost accomplish the purpose?

Mr. WALSH. That would appear to be the case from the statement here.

Mr. President, I am not unmindful of the force of the argument that is made here, and that doubtless was made before the committee, upon the ground of economy, but there never has been a time since this project was commenced, certainly no time since I have been in the Senate, when the argument of economy could not be urged with plausibility and with a great degree of force. But, Mr. President, the consideration to which I have adverted, and others, moved the Senate to act a year ago, when really the considerations impelling us to exercise economy in the very last degree were effective. The Senate recognized, in view of the appropriations that had been made theretofore—\$200,000 the year preceding, \$325,000 the year preceding that, and so on—if that policy were continued the overhead charges would be terribly burdensome ultimately and the completion of the project would be indefinitely delayed, and practically the guarantee of the Government to the settlers would be violated.

So, Mr. President, considering all these things, I have no doubt the Secretary of the Interior in making his estimate of \$750,000 for this project had in mind all the suggestions that have been made, to the effect that economy ought to be exercised. I have no doubt in the world that the House committee making the appropriation recognized the force of everything that could be said concerning the necessity of conserving all our resources for the purpose of carrying on this war. The House could not have been uninfluenced by the same considerations. So I do not believe that the argument here made ought to be persuasive now.

I do not desire to travel over the ground so ably covered by my colleague on yesterday, but I wish to advert to a consideration that is important in this connection. The most successful irrigation project in the State of Montana, and I undertake to say, without fear of contradiction from any source whatever, one of the most successful that the Government has undertaken, is the Huntley project in the Yellowstone Valley, in the State of Montana. The success of that project is very largely due, if it is not entirely due, to the fact that it is in the vicinity of Billings, Mont., at which is located a very large and successful beet-sugar factory.

Those lands are particularly adapted for beet culture, and only lands that are irrigated are available for that work. During the past year a very complete and extensive sugar-beet factory has been established at Missoula, a city to which this Flathead Reservation is immediately tributary. In addition to that a branch line of the Northern Pacific Railroad has been constructed up the Flathead Valley and through the Flathead Reservation, making practically all the lands under this great irrigation system available for beet culture, it being immediately tributary to Missoula. So we have added assurances in this fact of the ultimate success of this great enterprise.

Mr. President, it is true that you can cultivate grain upon the Flathead Reservation without irrigation. A crop will be insured in most of the seasons. But, Mr. President, you will bear in mind that the Flathead Reservation is 1,250 miles from the terminal market of Duluth and Minneapolis. It is nearly 700 miles from the market of Portland. I need say nothing further to assure everybody who knows anything about the cultivation of wheat that it can not be grown with success in that region by reason of the enormous distances to which it must be transported. It is most signally fortunate for this project that the beet-sugar factory has been established at Missoula.

My esteemed friend and neighbor, the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], is much concerned about the labor problem. It is, of course, a most serious one, but I can assure the Senate that, whatever may be the condition in the State of Utah, there was no difficulty experienced, at least last year, in harvesting crops in the State of Montana. I was there immediately after the harvest. I attended the State fair, and I found no complaints from any source of a lack of labor to take care of the crops, and our people have gone to work this spring with a purpose to sow a very much greater area than has ever been sown before. Apparently the labor proposition discouraged no one from making every possible effort toward producing everything that can be produced.

Accordingly I hope that the amendment offered by my colleague to amend the report of the committee by fixing the appropriation at \$500,000 may prevail.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] to increase this appropriation to \$500,000, I think, under the circumstances

should be defeated. The committee had three reasons for reducing the appropriation. The first was the question of economy; the second was the high cost of material; and the third was that there was not enough of the land used and cultivated by the Indians and settlers now under the ditch to justify a larger appropriation at this time.

It will be recalled that in the speech made by the senior Senator from Montana yesterday he stated there were 80,000 acres under the ditch, and that is the testimony that was given before the committee.

Mr. MYERS. How much did the Senator say? I did not catch it.

Mr. CURTIS. Eighty thousand acres. Of that 80,000 acres, according to the testimony, taking the last figures, those given by the Senator, there is a difference of only some 2,000 acres between the figures that I submitted yesterday and those submitted by the Senator; there are only 18,000 of the 80,000 acres cultivated.

It does seem to me that if the argument of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] is to be considered very seriously, there ought to be a showing made that more of that 80,000 acres of land is cultivated.

Mr. MYERS. If the Senator will permit me—

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly.

Mr. MYERS. Of course I can not give any assurance that the Indian part of the land will be cultivated any more this year than last year. The Senator from Kansas will remember that Mr. Bien, of the Reclamation Service, who was before the committee and gave the figures, stated that 50,000 or 60,000 of the 80,000 acres were owned by Indian allottees.

Mr. CURTIS. No.

Mr. MYERS. Yes; that is in the testimony. I can turn to it. Those were his words. I can produce them, I think; but I will make my statement, and then if the Senator wishes to dispute it—

Mr. CURTIS. No; I do not care to dispute the Senator's statement.

Mr. MYERS. The testimony shows that the water was put on the Indian land first. It was the primary object to get it on the Indian land. That policy has been pursued, and while the greater part of the Indian lands have been covered with water, not so great a proportion of the land of the white settlers has yet been reached; and he said of the 80,000 acres already covered 50,000 or 60,000 acres were Indian land. I can not give any assurance as to that, but I will say that of the lands of the white homesteaders, I am assured by many people who are interested, practically every acre that is subject to water will be put in cultivation and put to use this year. As to my authority, I will say one source is Hon. Addison K. Lusk, who lives on the reservation, and is a member of the Montana Legislature, and who appeared before the committee. He assured me he was able to say that practically every acre of the white homesteaders covered by water would be put in cultivation this year, and I have the same assurance from others. Why do they think so, the Senator may ask. For a number of reasons. Because they realize the necessity of producing as large a food crop as possible for our people in this crisis, and because they realize that they ought to make as great a showing as possible of their appreciation of this project in order to have it continued expeditiously. For those reasons and other reasons I can give the Senator the assurance that the lands of the white homesteaders will be quite completely cultivated this year.

Mr. CURTIS. Now, Mr. President, we will take the figures of the Senator from Montana, that 50,000 acres of this land under the ditch are Indian land. That leaves 30,000 acres of land under the ditch-settlers' land. Yet the report given by the Senator from Montana shows that only 15,000 acres, in round numbers, of the settlers' lands are being cultivated.

Mr. MYERS. I say Mr. Bien said 50,000 or 60,000. He did not say it was either. It may be 50,000; it may be 60,000.

Mr. CURTIS. The figures showed that three-eighths of this land was occupied by white settlers and five-eighths under the Indian allotment, which would make 50,000 acres. The Government has spent up to this time over \$3,000,000 and you have a showing of 80,000 acres under the ditch and only 18,000 acres of it cultivated. With that showing, is Congress justified in making this great appropriation? I, for one, do not believe that it is. The Indians surely are not taking advantage of the irrigation project. Only 969 acres of their land are being cultivated by the Indians and only 1,700 acres are being cultivated by their tenants.

I asked the Senator yesterday if it was the intention or if he thought that the Government had a right to attach a lien on the Indian allotments. I had a reason for that. The department to-day is forcing the patents upon those Indians without their

consent. It is forcing those patents, going so far as to file them of record, without the consent of the Indians. The statement was made that after those patents were filed, if the Indians attempted to sell the land, there would be a lien upon the allotment. I do not believe under the law Congress can now create a lien upon that land; I do not believe that the department has any right to fix a lien upon that land, because those Indians were allotted under the act of 1887, and in that act there is a positive promise in the following language:

That upon the approval of the allotments provided for in this act by the Secretary of the Interior he shall cause patents to issue therefor in the name of the allottees, which patents shall be of the legal effect and declare that the United States does and will hold the land thus allotted for the period of 25 years, in trust for the sole use and benefit of the Indian to whom such allotment shall have been made, or, in case of his decease, of his heirs according to the laws of the State or Territory where such land is located, and that at the expiration of said period the United States will convey the same by patent to said Indian, or his heirs as aforesaid, in fee, discharged of said trust and free of all charge or incumbrance whatsoever.

Under that provision of the law the Congress of the United States and the Indian Office can not put a lien upon the land allotted to those Indians under the trust patent.

Mr. MYERS. May I interrupt the Senator for a moment?

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly.

Mr. MYERS. If I am wrong, then, in assuming that the cost of putting water on the land by an Indian allottee is a lien on that allottee's allotment—if there is now a law covering it and it can not be done, and there is no lien—then what is the objection to going ahead with the project?

Mr. CURTIS. Because the Senator stated yesterday that the money, from whatever source, that might be placed in the Treasury to the credit of any Indian allottee would be held out to pay off this obligation.

Mr. MYERS. That is only my opinion. I am not the head of the Indian Bureau.

Mr. CURTIS. What are you doing? You are forcing upon these Indian allottees who are not using the water that obligation which the Senator thinks is a lien and which I deny. But whether it is a lien or not, you are putting it upon those Indians and you are going to take the money out of the Treasury as it goes in to their credit to pay off the lien.

Mr. MYERS. I should like to be understood. Of course, I can not speak with authority about what the Indian Bureau will do or what the properly constituted agencies of the United States Government will do. I was only saying what I assumed they would do and what I supposed they would do. It is for them to act, and, as far as I know, I do not know what they are going to do.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, this project was not selected for a reduction alone. Here is the chairman of the committee with irrigation projects in his State, and the appropriations for those projects were cut in two because we wanted to reduce the amount carried in this bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KING. This project and the conditions surrounding it are not very well known to me. I should like to ask the Senator, as I did not quite understand the point he was making a moment ago, whether the Government is building this reservoir and dam and furnishing water to the Indian lands without any charge to the Indians, either from the money of the Indians or from the lands?

Mr. CURTIS. When the Indians use the water they must pay the annual charge.

Mr. KING. Is there any provision by which the Government is to be reimbursed for the money which it expended in the construction of the reservoir?

Mr. CURTIS. Under the act of Congress of two years ago the settlers must pay their proportionate share and the Indian allottees must pay their proportionate share.

Mr. KING. Well, what is the complaint the Senator is making about the fee-simple titles being forced on them?

Mr. CURTIS. The complaint I am making is that they are forcing title upon these Indians without their consent, after having given them a trust patent under the act of 1887 and promising to give them a patent in fee at the end of 25 years, that would give them land free and clear of every encumbrance.

Mr. KING. Did the Indians understand, when this project was undertaken, that they would have to pay for the water, and do they now object to paying for the water?

Mr. CURTIS. Most of them do object to paying for the water. I have a petition here—and, by the way, I want to refer to the petition filed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS]; he had such a petition—I have a petition, signed by 65 Indian allottees under the project, stating that they did not want the water.

Mr. MYERS. I will say that I did not receive any such petition.

Mr. CURTIS. No; I am speaking about the petition which the Senator from Montana had in favor of the project. I have a petition, signed by 65 Indian allottees and signed by 5 settlers, owning, I think, some 8 or 10 tracts of land, according to the petition, and stating that they do not want the water. I do not know how these petitions were secured. I do not think the Senator from Montana knew how the one he presented was secured, but in the petition presented by him there is the name of one Indian who is in the penitentiary. I have a letter from him, stating that he never signed the petition and did not authorize anyone to sign it for him. I am told there is the name of an Indian woman on the petition who has been dead a number of years. I refer to this simply to call the attention of the Senate to the manner in which these petitions are gotten up.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Those petitions are like all others, are they not?

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Washington says they are like all other petitions.

The strongest point in favor of this measure is the fact that the Government did open up certain land to public settlement, and there were, as I recollect the testimony, between 500 and 600 settlers in that locality. They have 48,000 acres of land within the project. They were promised water, and I am satisfied the Government is going to give it to them. The point, however, is that this year, with the high cost of material, with so many thousand acres unused, was not the Committee on Indian Affairs justified in reducing this appropriation to \$250,000?

The chairman of the committee has within his State a number of projects, and yet he willingly consented to have the appropriation for his projects cut in two. Here are the Senators from Washington, neither of whom I believe agrees to the reduction, and who have, in my judgment, the best project on any Indian reservation in the United States, who were not given the amount estimated for the project in their State. We have another project in the State of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, who is now in the chair [Mr. KENDRICK], an item which was put into the bill by the other House, and yet that was stricken out. An amendment was presented by him, and refused. I refer to this simply to show that the committee tried to treat all sections alike in this bill, and that there was no animus at all.

I am sorry that the Senator from Montana yesterday saw fit to say that this matter was worked up by an attorney in this city and that the result of the reduction was brought about on account of the delegation that came here.

Mr. MYERS. Will the Senator from Kansas let me make a statement?

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly; I will.

Mr. MYERS. The Senator misunderstood me. I did not say that the action of the committee was the result of that. A reading of my statement in the Record will show that I did not say that.

Mr. CURTIS. I understood the Senator to say that, but I do not want to misquote him.

Mr. MYERS. I did not say that the action of the committee was the result of that. I was merely referring to the attitude of the Indians. I merely stated that up to the year before last no opposition had ever been heard from the Indians, and that there was no opposition from the Indians until a Washington attorney and a man of Indian blood from Oregon had appeared on the scene. I did not say that their action caused the result in the committee.

Mr. CURTIS. The truth is—and in justice to the committee I feel I should state it—that the committee agreed not to hear any member of the delegation representing these Indians on this question, expecting to hear only the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] being absent on account of sickness, to hear the officers of the department, and then take action; but while the hearing was going on the senior Senator from Montana produced a witness who lives on the reservation. After that outsider was heard, members of this delegation asked to be heard, and members of the tribe who were members of the delegation were heard in opposition to this appropriation. Those Indians, however, to be fair to that delegation, said to the committee, and they have said in the petition to Congress, that they have no opposition to the irrigation project if their lands are relieved from the charge; that they do not intend to take advantage of this system; that they do not intend to use the water; and that, therefore, they do not want to be charged for it. That is all this delegation has asked. They say if you will relieve their lands from that charge and want to go ahead and put water on and furnish it to the settlers and let them pay for

It, they have no objection; and I believe from the showing made, from the fact that only a small quantity over 900 acres of land is being irrigated by the Indians, that they are justified in asking for this relief.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President—

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I want to ask the Senator whether these lands will produce crops without irrigation?

Mr. CURTIS. I do not want to go into that matter, because I have no personal knowledge regarding it; but some of the witnesses testified that those lands produced better wheat without irrigation than with it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It merely struck me that if these lands were under the irrigation system and they are desert lands such as we have in our section of the country, they would be practically worthless without water, and that, therefore, the Indians would absolutely need water on their lands.

Mr. CURTIS. Some Indians appeared before our committee with samples of the products of last year, which they said was a very dry one. They exhibited fine potatoes and vegetables of all kinds, good wheat and other grains, which were raised without any irrigation. Many of these Indians at the hearings two years ago contended that irrigation is not needed, as I recollect. The dry-farming expert of the State was here, and witnesses before the committee testified as to how crops could be raised under the dry-farming system in that section.

I do not care to occupy the time of the Senate any longer, but I merely desire to say that it does seem to me that, with an expenditure of over \$3,000,000 and with nearly \$3,000,000 more required for the completion of the project, Congress should stop and think before it makes this appropriation, when it is shown that less than 20,000 acres of the 80,000 acres under the ditch are actually being cultivated by white settlers and by the Indians and their tenants.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS]. [Putting the question.] The yeas seem to have it.

Mr. MYERS. I ask for a division, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division is asked for. Those in favor of the amendment will rise and stand until counted. [A pause.] Those opposed will rise. [A pause.] The amendment is lost.

Mr. MYERS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE], who is absent from the Chamber, and so I withhold my vote.

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], which I transfer to the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] and vote "nay."

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], whom I do not see present. Therefore I withhold my vote, not knowing how he would vote on this question if present.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). Has the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut, which I transfer to the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and vote "yea."

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. I do not see him in his seat, and therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. McKELLAR (when the name of Mr. SHIELDS was called). I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIELDS] on official business.

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING]. He is absent, and I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], which I transfer to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, has the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have a pair with that Senator, and for that reason I withhold my vote.

Mr. SHERMAN. I wish to inquire if the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have a pair with the Senator from Kansas, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. KELLOGG. I wish to inquire if the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. KELLOGG. I announce my pair with that Senator, and withhold my vote.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I desire to inquire whether the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That Senator not being present, and having a general pair with him, I withhold my vote.

While I am on my feet I desire to state that my colleague, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF], is absent on account of illness.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, has the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. COLT. In the absence of that Senator I withhold my vote.

Mr. KELLOGG. I transfer my pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] and vote "nay."

Mr. WOLCOTT. I inquire if the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WARSON] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Having a general pair with that Senator I withhold my vote.

I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. SAULSBURY] and to state that he has a general pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], which I transfer to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS];

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED];

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES];

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH];

The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY]; and

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. KIRBY. I desire to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON] are detained on official business.

Mr. SHERMAN. I transfer the pair heretofore announced to the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] and vote "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 16, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—16.

Chamberlain	Kendrick	Myers	Smith, Ariz.
Hendersen	King	Pomerene	Smith, Ga.
Hollis	McCumber	Shafrath	Swanson
Jones, Wash.	McKellar	Sheppard	Walsh

NAYS—25.

Ashurst	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nelson	Thomas
Raid	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Tillman
Curtis	Kellogg	Norris	Trammell
Fall	Kenyon	Nugent	Wadsworth
France	Kirby	Page	
Gore	Lodge	Sherman	
Johnson, Cal.	McNary	Smoot	

NOT VOTING—54.

Bankhead	Fernald	Hitchcock	Pheasant
Beckham	Fletcher	James	Pittman
Borah	Frelinghuysen	Knox	Pointexter
Brandegge	Gallinger	La Follette	Ransdell
Broussard	Gerry	Lewis	Reed
Calder	Goff	McLean	Robinson
Colt	Gronna	Martin	Saulsbury
Culberson	Hale	Overman	Shields
Cummins	Harding	Owen	Simmons
Dillingham	Hardwick	Penrose	Smith, Md.

Smith, Mich.
Smith, S. C.
Sterling
Stone

Sutherland
Thompson
Townsend
Underwood

Vardaman
Warren
Watson
Weeks

Williams
Wolcott

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] the yeas are 16, the nays are 25. There are present and not voting the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT]. On the vote announced the amendment of the Senator from Montana is lost.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I move as a further amendment that "\$250,000" be stricken out of the committee amendment and "\$400,000" inserted. I submit that to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLIS in the chair). The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 35, line 17, it is proposed to amend the committee amendment by striking out "\$250,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$400,000."

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I certainly do not wish to take the time of the Senate, but I ought to say a word. Both Senators from Montana must know that, speaking from a personal standpoint, I should be glad to vote for this amendment. I do not share the opinion that some of my colleagues on the committee entertain as to the project. I think it is a very worthy project. The reasons that moved the committee and the only reasons that caused the committee to make these reductions were considerations of economy. I have never been an economist, Mr. President, unless it may be said that I am a "political" economist. I myself have never talked economy; I waste enough words, anyhow; and I think that in talking economy in matters of this kind we sometimes waste words, especially when our constituents send us here and tell us to get appropriations just as fast and as furiously as we may.

But, Mr. President, there is a point where serious men must pause in respect to public expenditures; there is a point where men of judgment ought to stop and reflect before they proceed to appropriate large sums of money out of the Treasury. Meritorious as all these projects are—the one in Montana, the one in Washington, the ones in Arizona, and that in Wyoming—the committee is of the opinion that, in view of the enormous national expenditures, the great demands made upon the Treasury, and in view of testimony, at this particular juncture it is wise and expedient not to appropriate the entire sum which the House of Representatives had seen fit to appropriate for projects in the States of Montana, Wyoming, and Washington. Therefore the appropriation for the Montana item was reduced by the committee from \$750,000 to \$250,000, and a very substantial decrease was made in the appropriation for the project in Washington. There could be no better project than the one in Washington, but we were of opinion that at this particular time the public interest would be served best by simply keeping the projects from falling into a state of disrepair rather than initiating new work, laudable as new work may be and beneficent as it will be in the future.

Mr. President, I have stated the reasons which induced the committee to make these changes. It is a very infrequent thing that the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs reduces an appropriation, as all Senators will bear witness; but if when we attempt to reduce appropriations we are to meet with discouragement and the committee is not to be sustained, our committee will fall back into our old-time inveterate habit of increasing instead of decreasing the appropriations.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Arizona, the chairman of the committee, to another consideration, which I think was a factor in eliminating these large appropriations from the bill. I refer to the question of labor. It was argued that all the labor we have will be needed for the production of crops, and that no irrigation projects should be undertaken at this time. A still further objection was made that the materials which must necessarily be used in the construction of irrigation projects at this time are exceptionally high, and it certainly would not be wise to expend vast sums of money for the extension of irrigation projects at a time when the materials used in their construction are perhaps from 100 to 150 per cent higher than they ever were before. I think, however, the most serious objection to these undertakings was the question of labor. I simply wanted to remind the chairman of the committee that that was also one of the factors which influenced the action of the committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona a question. I understand that this is an irrigation project and that there are now under irrigation about 80,000 acres of land. Is that true?

Mr. ASHURST. I will read from page 196 of the House hearings on the bill:

The area of irrigable land under project, 152,000 acres.

That is what the department says as to the number of acres that may be irrigated.

Area of irrigable land under constructed works, 63,000 acres.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I understood it was 80,000 acres.

Mr. ASHURST. I am reading from page 196 of the House hearings on which is set forth the statement of the department.

Mr. BANKHEAD. How many of those 63,000 acres are actually under cultivation?

Mr. ASHURST. Of the 63,000 acres, I believe that substantially eighteen or nineteen thousand acres are under irrigation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I understand that the appropriation estimated for by the department is entirely sufficient to take care of that project and prevent deterioration.

Mr. ASHURST. The testimony of Mr. Morris Bien, who represented the Reclamation Service before the committee and whose testimony was taken by your committee, was that it would require at least \$250,000 to continue the project—that is, to maintain it as a going project, prevent it from falling into disrepair, and prevent the work from deteriorating and the material from being scattered.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is the information I desired, and really I can see no use of increasing this appropriation.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Arizona admits that he is a political economist, but that is no distinction; there are many "political economists." I know numbers of them; that is, people who are economists for political reasons. It seems to me it is the most common branch of learning that I encounter anywhere. So the Senator is not entitled to any singular distinction on that account. We see evidences here every day that he has a great deal of company.

I did not feel that I would be doing my duty in this matter unless I gave the Senate a chance to vote on some amount less than the amount named in the first amendment which I offered, which was \$500,000. I thought it my duty to submit to the Senate and give it a chance to vote on an amendment proposing an appropriation of \$400,000, which is \$100,000 less than the amount named in my last amendment. I thought that concession might be sufficient to satisfy the "political economists." Therefore I submit this amendment to the wisdom of the Senate, and of course would be pleased to see it adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Montana to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, in regard to the assertion of the Senator from Arizona that the Yakima irrigation project is the best in the United States, it is not necessary for the Senator from Arizona to offer any proof on that subject. I admit it. It is true. But it seems to me that the committee have also conceded that this project in Montana, while it is not up to the standard of the one in the great Yakima Valley, on the Yakima Indian Reservation, is a good one. By their appropriation of \$250,000 for the project they approve it. That removes all discussion from the Senate as to whether or not this project is going to be adopted. They have adopted it. They are putting a large sum of money into it. The executive branch of the Government, charged with the responsibility of spending this money, recommend to Congress that the amount which they need for the economical conduct of this work is \$750,000.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GRONNA. I think the Senator is mistaken in his conclusions. I will say that this is not a new project. The project under consideration is not a new one. The Government has already expended about three million three or four hundred dollars on the project. This appropriation is simply an additional appropriation.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is what I stated.

Mr. GRONNA. I misunderstood the Senator, then.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I stated that it was not a new project, and that it had already been approved and adopted, and that this bill carried a large sum of money for the continuation of the work on it. My understanding was that the Reclamation Service estimated that for the proper prosecution of this work, upon

which several millions have already been expended, they should have during the next fiscal year \$750,000.

Mr. GRONNA. That would be, of course, for an extension of the project.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes; but it is regarded as the continuation, I understand, of this same project.

I am not in sympathy with the policy that has been advocated by some that because we are engaged in war all work of internal development and improvement ought to cease. I think that the demands of the war require the maintenance of all of our policies of internal improvement, internal development, and the prosecution of public works. The French Government is more intimately involved in the war than the United States is, or at least more directly. Ultimately, I think, we have as much interest in the war and are confronted with as vital results as France is; but France is more directly in touch with it now than we are, and has been fighting for her very life at the threshold of the Nation. It is not very long since there was a great celebration in France, right in the midst of the war, of the completion of the great Marseille Canal. They did not stop the construction of that great public work because they were involved in this war. They regarded it as essential to the prosperity and to the strength of the Nation, in war as well as in peace, to continue the improvement of the country and the development of its resources and its facilities.

Assuming that this is a meritorious project—as we must assume, because the committee has recommended the appropriation of \$250,000 for it—it seems to me it follows that the efficient development of it, the appropriation of a sufficient amount of money to carry on the work in a businesslike way, is in the interest of economy and in the interest of the development of our resources and the maintenance of the national strength. Generally speaking, I do not know of any class of public improvement that yields a larger return than approved irrigation projects. I know that there has been some effort to discredit them recently, but my opinion has never changed in regard to their merits. We see on every hand, and particularly we have a living object lesson in the State of Washington, that these projects, if carried on to their full development, not stopped half way, so that the full results can flow from the undertaking, yield as great returns and in some cases much greater returns than it had ever been estimated would be the result.

I thought I would say this word, although this project is not in my State. It seems to me that certain fundamental considerations rather support the position taken by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, he would be a very bold man who would be higher in his idea of the value of irrigation projects than I. Surely I have a right to speak with some authority on these Indian projects. I have with pride been watching their progress for four years as chairman of the committee and for six years as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee, and I ought to know something about them. I share the views expressed in the splendid speeches that the Senators from Montana have made with reference to the project in their State, and I agree also with the Senators from Washington as to the project on the Yakima Reservation. I repeat that my vote against this appropriation must not be construed as in any sense a feeling of hostility toward the irrigation interests of this country. Indeed, Mr. President, my distinguished colleague and I represent the premier irrigation State, of the agricultural interests of which we are so justly proud. Under the great Salt River project lands that before the project was built were worth but \$5 to \$10 an acre have sprung to a value of \$300 an acre, and are producing millions of dollars' worth of long-staple cotton. The rich lands of the Yuma project are becoming one of the great marvels in crop production. Irrigation is both ideal and practical. It appeals to the poetic fancy and to hard common sense. I am the earnest friend and ready champion of any and all projects where there may be the smallest opportunity for success. But because I am an earnest friend of the irrigation projects of our country it does not necessarily follow that I should vote for large expenditures and huge appropriations out of the Treasury at a time when you have to pay out \$3 to get \$1 worth of value.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. Let me finish the sentence. Assume this situation: Assume that a large potato crop was raised in a certain county and that 2,000 carloads could not be gathered, but rotted in their beds because they were not dug out of the ground. Assume a situation with reference to fruit, where \$14 per day was offered to agricultural laborers to gather fruit, but the fruit rotted on the trees. Can you fail to gather your harvest and then ask me to vote for large appropriations to stimulate and increase the production in that locality?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether the consideration of the committee amendments has been completed?

Mr. ASHURST. No, Mr. President; we have not completed the consideration of the committee amendments, and, indeed, there was a unanimous-consent agreement that we should complete the committee amendments first. If, however, individual Senators at this time wish to offer amendments in their own right, I have no objection, only I hope they will not lead to debate.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I prefer to take the orderly course, then, and I will let the committee proceed to dispose of its amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 35, after line 18, to strike out:

For continuing construction of the irrigation systems on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, in Montana, \$100,000 (reimbursable), which shall be immediately available and remain available until expended.

And insert:

For maintaining the irrigation systems on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, in Montana, \$25,000 (reimbursable), which shall be immediately available and remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, at the top of page 36, to strike out:

For continuing construction of the irrigation systems on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, in Montana, \$75,000 (reimbursable), which shall be immediately available and remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$25,000 of applicable appropriations made for the Flathead, Blackfeet, and Fort Peck irrigation projects shall be available for the maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles for official use upon the aforesaid irrigation projects: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$3,500 may be used for the purchase of horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, and that not to exceed \$4,000 may be used for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles.

And insert:

For continuing construction, maintenance, and operation of the irrigation systems on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, in Montana, \$50,000 (reimbursable), which shall be immediately available, and remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$15,000 of applicable appropriations made for the Flathead, Blackfeet, and Fort Peck irrigation projects shall be available for the maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles for official use upon the aforesaid irrigation projects: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$3,500 may be used for the purchase of horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, and that not to exceed \$4,000 may be used for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, under the head of "North Carolina," on page 43, line 6, to change the number of the section from 14 to 15, and in line 8, after the word "superintendent," to strike out "\$33,600; for general repairs and improvements, \$6,000; in all, \$39,600" and insert "\$41,600; for general repairs and improvements, \$6,000; in all, \$47,600," so as to make the clause read:

SEC. 15. For support and education of 200 Indian pupils at the Indian school at Cherokee, N. C., including pay of superintendent, \$41,600; for general repairs and improvements, \$6,000; in all, \$47,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 43, after line 11, to strike out:

For the construction of a bridge across the Oconalufly River, at or near the Indian school at Cherokee, N. C., \$8,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be expended until the Secretary of the Interior shall have obtained from the proper authorities of the State of North Carolina, or the county of Swain, satisfactory guarantees of the payment by the said State of North Carolina, or by the county of Swain, of at least one-half of the cost of the construction of said bridge, and that the proper authorities of the said State of North Carolina, or the said county of Swain, shall assume full responsibility for, and will at all times maintain and repair, said bridge and the approaches thereto: *And provided further*, That any and all expenses above the amount herein named in connection with the construction of said bridge shall be borne either by the said State of North Carolina or the said county of Swain.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not agree to this amendment.

I want to say that two years ago the Senate adopted this provision. The House refused to agree to it because they did not have the information before them. This time the House investigated it and put it on the bill.

We have a little band of Cherokee Indians in North Carolina, a Government reservation there of about thirty or forty thousand acres, and the county surrounding it has appropriated the sum of \$200,000 and has expended the money on the roads coming up to the Indian reservation. They have a river there which has yet to be bridged, and this is to appropriate the small sum of \$8,000 to build that bridge. It is on the Government reservation, right at the Government school, and the children can not get across the river unless the bridge is built. The county has built these fine roads right up to the Indian reservation, and there is the river, and they can not cross over it, and the county can not build it. Unless the Government builds it, they will have no bridge there. The Government has done nothing for these Cherokee Indians in the past except to give them a school.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator to say that the bridge was within the reservation?

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the committee, then, was under a misapprehension. The committee took the view that the bridge was not on the reservation.

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes, sir; I am informed that it is.

Mr. ASHURST. If this bridge is on the reservation, I wish to go on record unqualifiedly as voting for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next amendment passed over.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over will be found on page 63, where it is proposed to insert the following after line 10:

That section 6 of the act of Congress approved April 26, 1906 (34 Stat. L., pp. 137, 139), is hereby amended by substituting the following for the proviso in the concluding paragraph thereof: "Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to perform, in person or by his duly authorized representative, all duties devolving under existing law upon any officer of the Five Civilized Tribes, including the execution of tribal deeds and other instruments, in all cases where the position held by such officer is or shall become vacant."

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I make a point of order against the amendment from line 11 to line 21.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, personally I have no doubt that the item is obnoxious to the point of order, but I think one of the Senators from New Mexico is interested in the discussion of that item.

Mr. OWEN. I simply make the point of order against it, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will inquire of the Senator from Oklahoma what the point of order is?

Mr. OWEN. That it changes existing law; that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. General legislation on an appropriation bill?

Mr. OWEN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained. The Secretary will state the next amendment passed over.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over is, on page 75, at the foot of the page, where the committee amendment proposes to strike out "\$500,000" and to insert "\$250,000," so as to read:

For continuing construction and enlargement of the Wapato irrigation and drainage system, to make possible the utilization of the water supply provided by the act of August 1, 1914 (38 Stat. L., p. 604), for 40 acres of each Indian allotment under the Wapato irrigation project on the Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash., and such other water supply as may be available or obtainable for the irrigation of a total of 120,000 acres of allotted Indian lands on said reservation, \$250,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire cost of said irrigation and drainage system shall be reimbursed to the United States under the conditions and terms of the act of May 18, 1916: *Provided further*, That out of the sum herein appropriated the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to pay to Violetta Stone and W. D. Stone, husband and wife, the sum of \$629.48 for lands purchased of them for use in connection with the construction of the diversion dam across the Yakima River, as provided for in the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. L., p. 154), and the sum herein appropriated shall be available for the purchase of such other lands as may be required in connection with the construction of the aforesaid irrigation project.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, in view of the statements of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] and also of the chairman of the committee with reference to the Yakima project, that it is one of the best if not the best in the United States, it is not necessary to go into details as to the merits of this proposition; but I hope that the Senate will not adopt the amendment proposed by the committee, and I will state just briefly why I think that amendment ought to be rejected.

I believe in economy; but there is sometimes no economy in not making the appropriations necessary to keep the Government work going on as it ought to go. As a matter of fact, I

think the most waste that we have committed in connection with Government work results from our failing to provide the money to do the work in a businesslike way; and so here, I think, to cut this appropriation down to \$250,000 is not economy but is an actual waste, and will result in waste to the Government in the end. Of course, it makes the appropriation for this year \$250,000 less than the amount proposed by the House, but ultimately this project will cost more by reason of cutting it down to \$250,000 than it would cost if we appropriated the \$500,000; and in my judgment we ought to appropriate more than \$500,000.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. I notice that the item reads:

For the irrigation of a total of 120,000 acres of allotted Indian lands on said reservation, \$500,000.

If that amount is reduced to \$250,000, could not the department have prepared for irrigation 60,000 acres of that land?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No. The Senator, I think, has a wrong idea as to the project.

Mr. CURTIS. I simply wanted to know what the fact was in that regard.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Probably I had better explain the situation just a little bit.

On the Yakima Indian Reservation there is a project known as the Wapato irrigation project. That is not a reclamation project under the Reclamation Service, but it is an Indian irrigation project and the work is being done by the Indian Service. This Wapato project contemplates the ultimate reclamation of 174,000 acres of land. There is one unit of that project, however, that will cover 120,000 acres when that unit is completed. All this land was allotted Indian land. The Indians have sold some of their lands, so that about 20,000 acres of this land that is under the proposed reclamation project is owned by private parties. There are no homesteads involved in this case as in the Montana case. The total cost of reclaiming this 120,000 acres is estimated at about \$3,000,000, so that this \$500,000 does not complete the project for the reclamation of 120,000 acres of land, but that is just what they provide for this year. As I say to the Senator, it will cost ultimately about \$3,000,000. We have appropriated, I think, about \$400,000 to carry on this project. In the last bill we appropriated \$200,000 and in the preceding bill we appropriated \$200,000 to begin to carry on the work.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. May I ask the Senator if there is a limitation on the cost of the project?

Mr. JONES of Washington. There is no limitation except the estimate submitted by the Indian Office when the project was, we might say, adopted.

I might refer to this phase of the situation, and I hope the Senator will notice it:

For a great many years—in fact, ever since the treaty was made, I think, in 1857, or at any rate since the value of water for irrigation has been realized—there has been a controversy between the Indians and the Government of the United States as to the division of the water in the Yakima River. The Yakima River is the source of irrigation for this reservation; but prior to this controversy coming up, and upon the inducement of the Government, white settlers had gone into that valley generally and had taken up lands under the desert-land act, homestead and otherwise, until they had actually appropriated for irrigation purposes every drop of water of the Yakima River that flows in its channel at the low-water stage. Now, the Indians have asserted this claim: The Indians have contended for a long time that they were entitled to one-half of the water flowing in the Yakima River. They have been asserting that claim for a great many years. To allow that claim and to carry it out would be to dispossess and deprive thousands of settlers of the water that they have put on their land, and destroy their crops and work irreparable injury.

Congress wrestled with that matter for quite a while, and finally got a commission to go out—a joint commission of the House and the Senate—and that commission recognized the justice of the Indian's claim, but it also recognized the condition that had been permitted to grow up in that valley and the injury and damage that would be done if the Indians were allowed to take half of the water out of the natural, normal, low-water flow of the Yakima River. So, in order to do justice to the Indians and in order to do justice to the settlers who had gone in there at the invitation, in fact, of the Government, this joint commission of the House and Senate rec-

commended that we buy stored water for the Indians equivalent to one-half the flow in the Yakima River and furnish them a free water right for one-half of each allotment. Congress did that, and we appropriate in this bill, I think, the fifth payment of \$100,000 of the amount, \$635,000, that it was estimated it would cost to furnish stored water to supply these Indian lands. When that was done, they also submitted an estimate of the cost of reclaiming the largest body of land that it was possible to reclaim there. That project embraced this 120,000 acres, and the cost was about \$3,000,000; and we have started on it and appropriated, as I remember, \$400,000 in two Indian bills before this. So this appropriation made by the House of \$500,000 was simply intended to carry on the reclamation of these lands.

It was necessary to include all these lands in this project, because, as the Senator well knows, you can not irrigate one-half of an allotment and let the other half go. Furthermore, to do that would make it tremendously expensive, even if you could do it. So that all the lands were included, and the Indians have to pay for the water right for 40 acres of an 80-acre allotment, and the white people have to pay their part for the water for their land. All of this money will be ultimately repaid to the Government. There is not any doubt about the repayment of this money. So that as a matter of fact this is a loan of money in order to carry on a Government project for the reclamation of Indian lands, and every dollar of it will eventually come back to the Government.

Unless the Senator wants more information as to the details of the project itself, I will not take further time on that point.

None of the objections urged by the Senator from Kansas to the project in Montana apply to the project in Washington, unless it be the matter of economy or keeping down the appropriation. The question of labor was raised by some Senators, by the Senator from South Dakota. Of course, we have not all the labor that we want in this valley. Our people have some difficulty and some trouble in getting labor. The demand is very great; but the fact is that we have always secured all the labor that was necessary to get our crops in and get them harvested, and we expect to do it this year. We have been enlarging the area in different parts of the valley, and our people expect to enlarge the area this year, and there is not any question but that every foot of land that is made available for cultivation and for irrigation will be irrigated and cultivated.

Now, let me suggest this as to the importance attached to this project by the officers of the Government: They considered it so important that last year, in the extra session of Congress, an estimate and recommendation came to this body from the Secretary of the Interior urging that an appropriation of \$750,000 be made for this project as an emergency appropriation. Of course, the Appropriations Committee did not feel justified in putting it in the emergency appropriation act, because if that were put in many other claims would be presented, and so it was rejected; but that shows the importance that the department attached to it. Why did they send down this estimate? They sent down this estimate for this project because of its very great importance for furnishing additional food products; and the showing here was that by the expenditure of a dollar of Government money we would get products that the Government needs to the extent of \$1, \$2, or \$3. The showing is that on these lands we can produce from 40 to 60 bushels of wheat to the acre. I have here a statement from the superintendent in charge of this irrigation under the Indian Office, and he estimates that the production per acre is 60 bushels; or, making a conservative estimate of 50 bushels to the acre, he estimates that each year we would have an appropriation of \$750,000 we would put under cultivation 30,000 acres of land that would produce 50 bushels of wheat per acre, or a total of 1,500,000 bushels of wheat—one of the farm products that this country deems absolutely vital to the success of this war.

It seems to me that that is something which should appeal to the Senate; that it is something which should appeal to the Congress of the United States; and that it ought to offset this proposition of economy. Every foot of land that can be reclaimed here will be cultivated. The superintendent made the estimate last year when the recommendation of \$750,000 was made, that if \$750,000 was made available last year 30,000 acres of additional land would be brought under irrigation and cultivation this year, and that if \$750,000 would be available for the next year there would be 30,000 acres more next year subject to cultivation; in other words, with the proper appropriation we would have in two years 60,000 acres of additional farm land under cultivation. At 58 bushels to the acre that would be 3,000,000 bushels of wheat that it would make available. Of course, all this land probably would not be put in wheat, but much of it in potatoes. Last year on the Yakima Indian reservation, upon the urging of Government people and those inter-

ested, eleven or twelve thousand acres of potatoes were planted and harvested. Every foot of land that can be irrigated now has been and is being cultivated. So there is no question of that character arising in connection with it.

I wish to call attention to another fact. This matter was represented to the State council of defense, and their opinion was asked with reference to it. They adopted a resolution, which I desire to read. This is not a petition from the landowners or those directly interested. It is not a statement made by them, but it is the council of defense not of the county but of the State, composed of men from all parts of the State who are looking upon this matter from a patriotic standpoint, and upon the showing made they adopted this resolution:

Copy of resolution adopted by the Washington State council of defense, July 17, 1917:

Whereas a loan from the Government war funds—

I will say, in explaining the resolution, they thought that without getting an appropriation from Congress the President might allot a sum of money out of the \$100,000,000 that we left with him, so they worded their resolution in that way, and really made it a recommendation to the President to allot out of the war fund we gave him the necessary sum of money to carry on this work—

Whereas a loan from the Government war funds to the Indian Service of somewhat less than \$2,000,000, to be expended in the extension of the Wapato, Simcoe-Toppenish, and Satus irrigation projects in the Yakima Indian Reservation will make available for wheat production in 1918 30,000 acres of exceedingly fertile lands capable of producing more than a million bushels of wheat, and in 1919 an additional 30,000 acres of equally fertile land, making possible the production of more than 2,000,000 bushels of wheat in 1919;

Whereas the production of such additional 3,000,000 bushels of wheat in two years appears to be a vital military need;

Whereas there is no project in the West where an expenditure of approximately \$25 per acre will produce such an increased wheat production of 3,000,000 bushels in two years and 2,000,000 bushels each year thereafter; and

Whereas the rental value of these unused acres is very much needed by the Indian owners, and there is an immediate demand for every acre of these reservation lands as soon as placed under water: Be it

Resolved, That the National Council of Defense, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Interior be urged to arrange for the advancing to the Yakima Indian Reservation service from the war funds of the Government sufficient money for the extension of said irrigation projects, said funds to be returned to the Government by the owners of said lands in annual installments: Be it

Resolved further, That the Senators and Representatives from this State be requested to use their influence with the National Defense Council and the respective departments of the Government to accomplish this purpose.

That is the recommendation of the State council of defense, placing the matter upon the basis of a national necessity by men thoroughly acquainted with the situation and the possibilities of the project.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator kindly yield to me?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. ASHURST. I wish to call attention to the situation which actually exists. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that a similar organization composed of able, patriotic men in my own State sent to me, and I have no doubt sent to my colleague [Mr. SMITH], a statement that we at once ought to exercise our energies to secure an additional \$500,000 in this bill to stimulate and increase agricultural development in Arizona. There must be a limit somewhere, and the hard and fast line was drawn by the committee. We did not discriminate. The Arizona appropriations were reduced by the committee, and a delegation came on here to talk to me about it. I could not play favorites. I could not vote to reduce appropriations in other States and then increase the appropriations in Arizona.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I hope I have not said a word to lead the chairman of the committee to think that I was thinking the committee had acted unwisely.

Mr. ASHURST. No; the Senator has not.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Or acted in a discriminating way or anything of that sort.

Mr. ASHURST. I was only saying that each locality views the matter from its local viewpoint, and that large appropriations are sought to be made out of the Treasury to stimulate agriculture in this and that locality. This committee was required to look at the situation as a whole and view it by and large.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I hope the Senator does not feel that I am reflecting upon the action of the committee.

Mr. ASHURST. On the contrary, Mr. President, the Senator has made a very able and a very respectful argument. I have not risen to criticize anything or to object to anything the Senator has said. I feared when the Senator sat down we might have a vote or might adjourn, and I wanted to give in a few words the reason which moved the committee to reduce the appropriation from \$500,000 to \$250,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am just presenting my own proposition upon its merits in the hope that it will appeal to the good judgment of the Senate. I know what actuated the committee, and I have no criticism to make upon its action. The committee felt that they should cut these appropriations down. They felt that they should treat every project in the bill on the same principle and in the same way, and with that I am not finding fault; but I am appealing to the Senate in the hope that the merits of my proposition may convince the Senate that in this case, at any rate, the Senate may think a wiser course could be followed in the interests of the Government.

I know the action of the committee is based upon a fair conception of acting for the best interests of the Government. I do not question that for one moment; but I believe that the interests of the Government will be promoted by allowing the provision that the House adopted to stand. In the first place, as I said a while ago, I think it is not economical to cut up these projects and furnish an amount of money that will not carry them on in the most economical way. Much of the force that will be gotten together under a \$250,000 appropriation will have to be disbanded before the year is up, and when another appropriation is made to carry on the work for another year it will cost more to get that force together. So instead of saving money, in the end you will lose money. But the committee took a different view of that. I hope the Senate will conclude that the committee took the wrong view and that they will reject the committee amendment. But, independent of that, I think the interest of the Government in this national crisis will be conserved by making an appropriation that will, at any rate, insure the reclamation of 30,000 acres of land for the next year.

What is the result if you do not do it? According to the superintendent of irrigation, we will get more than 8,000 acres additional for the next year with the \$250,000; but his estimate is that if we had \$750,000 we would get 30,000 acres. In other words, if we get an appropriation of \$500,000 we shall probably get 20,000 or 24,000 acres, but with the appropriation of \$250,000 we will get only 8,000 acres additional on this reservation. Is that wise? I do not think so.

Now, about the additional cost of the work of irrigation, here is what the engineer says, and I simply give you his statement. He met that objection. He said:

The question has arisen as to what effect the high cost of labor and materials will have on the total cost of the project. While this might increase the cost to some extent, the 20 per cent added to all estimates—

That is the general lump sum that they add in connection with these irrigation projects after they have made an estimate of the cost; they add a lump sum of about 20 per cent to cover contingencies and exigencies. He says—

the 20 per cent added to all estimates for contingencies is thought to be sufficient to cover any increased cost on account of labor and materials being higher than usual. Should it increase the cost, however, the farmers would be able and willing to pay for this increased cost on account of getting higher prices for their products.

The owners of the land could well afford to pay any additional cost at this time.

Mr. President, this work has been going on. Every dollar that you expend for extension of agriculture—and that is what it amounts to—will be beneficial in the way of bringing additional land under irrigation. You do not have to extend your canal any considerable distance, or any distance at all, until you make the water available for irrigation. That is one of the peculiar features of this project in the beginning. From the time when it was commenced, when you got the main canal out a quarter of a mile, you could begin to irrigate a large area of land; and so, as you extend it, it simply brings an additional area under irrigation. But I take it it is not necessary to go into that.

Mr. President, I am not going to take the time of the Senate any further. The Senate knows the attitude of the committee.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator pardon me just a moment?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator, I hope, will not think me impertinent.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Not at all.

Mr. ASHURST. I simply desire to inquire if the Senator intends to ask for the yeas and nays, because that will guide my course.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I should like to have the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. ASHURST. I fear there will not be a quorum at this time. Will the Senator object to postponing the vote until tomorrow morning?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No.

Mr. ASHURST. The bill may then be laid aside for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the consideration of the amendment will be postponed until to-morrow.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. Unless there is some matter that some Senator desires particularly to bring before the Senate, I wish to move an executive session. I make that motion.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened.

RECESS.

Mr. ASHURST. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 27, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 26, 1918.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Joseph H. Lyon, of Mobile, Ala., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 19, with headquarters at Mobile, Ala., in place of Percy W. Maer, whose term of office expired by limitation March 8, 1918.

SUPERVISING INSPECTOR, STEAMBOAT-INSPECTION SERVICE.

Oscar G. Haines, of New Jersey, to be supervising inspector, fifth district, in the Steamboat-Inspection Service, Department of Commerce, vice Eugene E. O'Donnell, resigned. (By promotion from local inspector of hulls.)

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONIES.

Scott White, of Florence, Ariz., to be receiver of public moneys at Phoenix, Ariz., vice John J. Birdno, deceased.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Frank Laning, of California, to be register of the land office at Visalia, Cal., his present term expiring April 30, 1918. (Re-appointment.)

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL CORPS.

First Lieut. James Harold Leyda, Medical Reserve Corps, to be first lieutenant from March 8, 1918.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

Lieut. Col. William G. Gambrell, Quartermaster Corps, to be colonel with rank from March 15, 1918.

Maj. James A. Logan, Jr., Quartermaster Corps, to be lieutenant colonel with rank from March 15, 1918.

TRANSFER TO THE ACTIVE LIST OF THE ARMY.

INFANTRY.

To be major with rank from May 15, 1917.

First Lieut. Charles C. Todd (retired).

To be captain with rank from July 1, 1916.

Second Lieut. Claude N. Feamster (retired).

TEMPORARY PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from February 25, 1918.

Maj. Clifford C. Carson, Coast Artillery Corps.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from February 28, 1918.

Maj. George T. Perkins, Coast Artillery Corps (General Staff Corps).

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from March 1, 1918.

Maj. John B. Murphy, Coast Artillery Corps.

Maj. Jairus A. Moore, Coast Artillery Corps (Quartermaster Corps).

Maj. Frank B. Edwards, Coast Artillery Corps.

Maj. Henry C. Merriam, Coast Artillery Corps.

Maj. Harry W. McCauley, Coast Artillery Corps.

Maj. Robert W. Collins, Coast Artillery Corps.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from March 2, 1918.

Maj. Elisha G. Abbott, Coast Artillery Corps.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from March 3, 1918.

Maj. Samuel M. English, Coast Artillery Corps.

To be major with rank from January 4, 1918.

Capt. Edward J. Cullen, Coast Artillery Corps.

To be majors with rank from January 25, 1918.

Capt. Joseph J. Grace, Coast Artillery Corps.

Capt. Oscar A. Russell, Coast Artillery Corps (Quartermaster Corps).

Capt. Walter J. Buttgenbach, Coast Artillery Corps.

Capt. Charles O. Schudt, Coast Artillery Corps.

To be major with rank from January 26, 1918.

Capt. Marcellus H. Thompson, Coast Artillery Corps.

To be majors with rank from January 28, 1918.

Capt. William W. Rose, Coast Artillery Corps.

Capt. Albert Gilmor, Coast Artillery Corps.

To be majors with rank from January 30, 1918.

Capt. Clarence A. Mitchell, Coast Artillery Corps.

Capt. William P. Currier, Coast Artillery Corps (Quartermaster Corps).

Capt. Horace F. Spurgin, Coast Artillery Corps.

To be majors with rank from January 31, 1918.

Capt. Edward A. Brown, Coast Artillery Corps (Quartermaster Corps).

Capt. John G. Donovan, Coast Artillery Corps.

Capt. Guy L. Gearhart, Coast Artillery Corps (Aviation Section, Signal Corps).

Capt. Allen Kimberly, Coast Artillery Corps.

Capt. Geoffrey Bartlett, Coast Artillery Corps.

To be major with rank from February 1, 1918.

Capt. William E. Shedd, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.

To be majors with rank from February 5, 1918.

Capt. Robert Arthur, Coast Artillery Corps.

Capt. William P. Wilson, Coast Artillery Corps.

To be captain with rank from December 22, 1917.

First Lieut. Ross G. Hoyt, Coast Artillery Corps.

To be captain with rank from December 23, 1917.

First Lieut. William Mayer, Coast Artillery Corps.

To be captain with rank from December 24, 1917.

First Lieut. Hubert A. McMorro, Coast Artillery Corps.

To be captain with rank from December 25, 1917.

First Lieut. Douglas G. Clark, Coast Artillery Corps.

To be captains with rank from December 26, 1917.

First Lieut. Vernon G. Cox, Coast Artillery Corps.

First Lieut. Ralph G. Lockett, Coast Artillery Corps.

To be captain with rank from December 29, 1917.

First Lieut. William F. Lafrenz, Coast Artillery Corps.

NOTE.—This message is submitted for the purpose of correcting errors in the dates of rank of the nominees. These officers were nominated to the Senate January 31, 1918, and confirmed by that body February 13, 1918.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 26, 1918.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Scott White to be receiver of public moneys at Phoenix, Ariz.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

John J. Bradley to be United States marshal northern district of Illinois.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, March 26, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, Almighty God our Heavenly Father, for all the good, the generous, the pure, the noble, the brave, the great, whom Thou hast from time to time raised up, who by devotion to duty and the rectitude of their behavior left the world better than they lived and wrought.

By devotion to our duty, in the spirit of emulation, help us to leave behind us a record worthy of emulation by those who shall come after us; in the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ, Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SOUTH DAKOTA'S RATIFICATION OF PROHIBITION AMENDMENT.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Speaker, South Dakota has ratified the proposed constitutional amendment for prohibition. I send to the Clerk's desk a certified copy of the proceedings.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Certificate.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA, SECRETARY'S OFFICE.

I, Frank M. Rood, secretary of state, do hereby certify that the annexed senate joint resolution No. 1 was duly passed by the 1918 special session of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota, at the city of Pierre, March 22, 1918.

FRANK M. ROOD,
Secretary of State.

A joint resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America relating to the manufacture, sale, and transportation of intoxicating liquors.

Whereas both Houses of the Sixty-fifth Congress of the United States of America, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment to the Constitution be, and hereby is, proposed to the States, to become valid as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of the several States as provided by the Constitution:

"ARTICLE —.

"SECTION 1. After one year from the ratification of this article the manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof for beverage purposes is hereby prohibited.

"SEC. 2. The Congress and the several States shall have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring:

SECTION 1. That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, ratified by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this preamble and joint resolution be forwarded to the governor of this State, to the Secretary of State at Washington, to the presiding officer of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

A. C. ROBERTS,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

CHAS. M. GARDNER,
Chief Clerk.
W. H. MCMASTER,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

W. N. VAN CAMP,
Secretary of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the within act originated in the senate, and was known in the senate files as senate joint resolution No. 1.

W. N. VAN CAMP,
Secretary of the Senate.

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA.

Office of secretary of state, ss:

Filed March 22, 1918, at 3.40 o'clock p. m.

FRANK M. ROOD,
Secretary of State.
By GEO. F. SAYERS,
Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Speaker, when South Dakota was admitted into the Union in 1889, when her constitution was submitted to the people for ratification at the general election on October 1 of that year, a separate provision for prohibition was submitted at the same time. At that election there were 40,234 votes in favor of the constitutional provision for prohibition and 34,510 votes against it.

In 1895 the Legislature of South Dakota submitted to the people of the State a proposed repeal of this constitutional provision, and at the general election in 1896 the vote for repeal stood 31,901 for it and 24,910 against it. In 1916 an amendment for prohibition was again submitted to the electors of the State, and the vote at that general election was 65,334 in favor of prohibition and 53,380 against it. The legislature met in January, 1917, and enacted a bone-dry law, which went into effect on July 1, 1917. That law has been vigorously enforced, and it has been violated only in few instances.

Recently the Legislature of South Dakota convened in special session and by unanimous vote of both Houses, not a single vote being cast against it, ratified the Federal prohibition amendment. I take some pride and satisfaction in the record made by my State. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment

of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 389) to extend the time for cutting timber on the Coconino and Tusayan National Forests, Ariz.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses upon the bill (H. R. 9867) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and prior fiscal years on account of war expenses, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3426. An act to empower the President to requisition, for war purposes, timber and timber products, rights of way, and logging equipment; to construct and operate logging roads and saw-mills; and fixing a penalty for the violation thereof.

ARMS AND AMMUNITION.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Record a speech delivered by me before the Union League Club in New York some 10 days ago on the subject of arms and ammunition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing a speech that he delivered before the Union League Club about 10 days ago on the subject of arms and ammunition. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FOURTH-CLASS POST OFFICES.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I offered an amendment to the postal employees' salary bill, which was intended for the relief of post offices of the fourth class that had been made central accounting offices. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], in opposing that amendment, made the statement that there were no fourth-class post offices that were central accounting offices. I disputed that statement at the time. Of course, it is too late now to correct whatever adverse effect the gentleman's statement may have had upon my amendment, which, of course, was very great because of his prestige as a member of the Post Office Committee and as an expert on these questions; but in the interest of accuracy I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that upon inquiry at the office of the Auditor for the Post Office Department I find that there are 196 fourth-class offices that are now central accounting offices; that 21 of these are in Kentucky alone, and 5 in my own district, as I stated yesterday. I have discovered that there is even one in the gentleman's own State of Illinois, in Elizabethtown, Hardin County.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. And there are 40,000 fourth-class post offices.

Mr. LANGLEY. I do not question that; but the gentleman said there were no fourth-class post offices that were central accounting offices, and yet the records of the department show that there are 196 of them.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, it was not the intention to have any; I knew that.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman was simply mistaken. Inasmuch as he now seems willing to concede that I was right and he was wrong, I believe that is all I want to say.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Young, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 9352) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for an Assistant Secretary of War," approved March 5, 1890, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. HITCHCOCK, and Mr. WARREN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 389. An act to extend the time for cutting timber on the Coconino and Tusayan National Forests, Ariz.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 9571. An act to authorize the appointment of officers of the Philippine Scouts as officers in the militia or other locally created armed forces of the Philippine Islands drafted into the service of the United States, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9903. An act to provide for restoration to their former grades of enlisted men discharged to accept commissions, and for other purposes.

URGENT DEFICIENCIES.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the urgent deficiency bill (H. R. 9867).

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, this is a most important report. There have been one or two changes in the early part of the bill, made, I understand, chiefly as a result of the labors and ability of the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations [Mr. SHERLEY]. I think there ought to be a quorum here during the consideration of it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman makes the point of no quorum present.

Mr. SHERLEY. Personally I hope the gentleman will not insist on the point. I think there will be plenty of Members in attendance here before we are through with the consideration of the report.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman withdraw his motion?

Mr. WALSH. I dislike very much to disagree with the distinguished gentleman, but I think there should be a more full attendance in the House.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum.

Mr. SHERLEY. I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anthony	Fordney	Key, Ohio	Rowland
Blackmon	Gandy	Kreider	Schall
Borland	Gard	LaGuardia	Scott, Pa.
Caldwell	Good	Lenroot	Scully
Chandler, N. Y.	Goodall	Littlepage	Smith, Chas. B.
Church	Gould	McCulloch	Smith, Thos. F.
Classon	Graham, Pa.	Mann	Stephens, Nebr.
Cooper, Ohio	Gregg	Mason	Templeton
Copley	Hamill	Miller, Minn.	Thomas
Curry, Cal.	Harrison, Miss.	Miller, Wash.	Tinkham
Davidson	Harrison, Va.	Mott	Van Dyke
Dent	Hayes	Overmyer	Vare
Dies	Helntz	Pou	Ward
Drukker	Hollingsworth	Powers	Wood, Ind.
Eagle	Johnson, S. Dak.	Price	
Fairchild, G. W.	Kahn	Riordan	
Flood	Kehoe	Roberts	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and sixty-six Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the conferees.

[For conference report and statement see proceedings of Saturday, March 23, 1918, pp. 3967 to 3971.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, the urgent deficiency bill as it passed the House carried a total of \$687,830,482.46 of cash appropriations and authorizations of \$419,339,000. As it passed the Senate it carried in direct appropriations \$761,780,912.20 and the same amount of authorizations, or an increase in the bill of \$73,950,449.74. As it came out of conference there had been a recession on the part of the Senate of \$30,079,142.74 and a recession on the part of the House of \$43,871,307, so that the bill now carries \$731,901,789.46. The reason for the addition of \$43,000,000 over the bill as it passed the House was due, not simply to increases in items that had been passed upon by the House but to the fact that estimates of considerable size came to the Congress after the hearings had been closed and too late to be considered by the House committee; and those estimates were very properly taken to the Senate committee and there considered and some of them allowed, some of them rejected. It resulted from that that there were added matters by the Senate which had not been passed upon by the House and that the increases were not of the ordinary kind representing increases in matters upon which the House had expressed judgment. That was true of nearly all of the \$73,000,000 that were added. The Senate made few changes in matters that had been considered by the House, and of the \$73,000,000 they added they sub-

sequently receded from some \$30,000,000. So much for the general financial statement.

There were placed by the Senate upon the bill two provisions of first importance—provisions of legislation that the House should be fully advised of. One of them provided for the purchase by the Government of the Hoboken docks owned by the Hamburg-American and North German Lloyd Steamship Cos., German companies, the title to these properties, however, being held by two American corporations, the stock of which, however, is all German owned.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I prefer to make a general statement touching these matters and then I shall yield to inquiries. There was also a provision added which enlarged the scope of the power of the Alien Property Custodian. Under the law as it passed the Congress touching alien property the Alien Property Custodian was given the custody of such property for management and control, but with the right to sell only in order to prevent waste, that limitation having been put into the bill in conference and not having been in the bill as it passed through the House or the Senate. The Senate Committee on Appropriations, upon representations made by the Alien Property Custodian, reported a provision authorizing the Alien Property Custodian to sell any property of aliens that came into his possession, the same as if he were the absolute owner thereof, provision, of course, being made for the turning of the moneys into the Treasury of the United States. When the bill reached the floor of the Senate there was added an amendment, upon the motion of the Senator from New Jersey, in the way of a proviso, which required that all property sold by the Alien Property Custodian should be sold to American citizens at public auction to the highest bidder. That amendment was adopted by the Senate, and the provision in that form came to the House and subsequently went to conference. The House conferees agreed to the amendment of the Senate touching the right of the United States to buy the properties at Hoboken, the change made being largely a change in form and not in substance. The Senate amendment as it passed the Senate provided that the President might buy these properties, and further provided that if the price could not be agreed upon that 75 per cent of the value fixed by the President as just compensation might be paid to the person entitled to receive the same, and such person should have the right, having declined to accept the full amount, to sue for such additional sum as he felt entitled to. In other words, the same provision was inserted in the Senate amendment touching the payment of the purchase price of this property as had been provided in connection with property taken by the Government from American citizens, but it did not seem to the House conferees that there was any reason for such a provision under these particular circumstances. We were providing in the second amendment for the right of the Alien Property Custodian to sell any property held by him, and we were providing in the first amendment for the right of the United States Government to buy these particular properties. It did not seem either necessary or desirable to make a distinction between the situation that would arise when the Government bought and when a private person bought. If any private person buys property from the Alien Property Custodian, he simply pays the money to the Alien Property Custodian, and it is then held subject to such disposition as may be arrived at at the end of the war. There was no reason for authorizing suit against the Federal Government touching the price that should be paid.

If the person authorized to sue in the Senate amendment meant the Alien Property Custodian, there was no reason to have him sue the Federal Government. If it meant the German owners of the property, there was a very great reason why they should not be permitted to sue the Government, because it would result that the Government would put itself in the position where it would be bound by the judgment of its own courts and yet the other party to the suit would not be bound, and the final disposition of the moneys that come from the sale of alien property in America will have to be settled at the council table when peace shall come between the warring nations. There was no wisdom in such a provision. The House conferees therefore insisted that the first amendment should simply carry the right to the President to buy, and the Senate acquiesced in that viewpoint. When it came to the second amendment, the provision as it had passed the Senate, while doubtless intended to safeguard the disposition of this property, might have, and in many instances would have, resulted in transferring the property back into the hands of the very people that we desired to take it from, because by having an absolute requirement that the sale must be made to American citizens at public auction to the highest bidder, in many instances it meant that the minority interests, American in name

only, would have been the actual purchasers, and the property would really be held in the future, as in the past, for Germany. No greater blow and no more legitimate blow can be struck in this country against our enemy, Germany, than by depriving her of the industrial control that she had through ownership of many corporations and many industries in America. [Applause.] And we would be lacking in ordinary common sense, to say nothing of patriotism, if we did not provide for a separation of these German citizens from control in great industrial matters. A recital could be made, taking hours, showing instance after instance where the German control of industries in this country is great enough to have very far-reaching influence upon the life and the trade of this country. Now, we all of us recognized the need of ending that commercial influence and control. We also recognized the desirability of safeguarding, so far as it can be done, the disposition of this property, which runs into the hundreds of millions, having in mind the major purpose of the legislation, and that presented the real problem to the conference, a problem that was not entirely easy of solution. We present to you the report in the belief that it has been intelligently solved. We provide that when the property is sold it shall be sold at public sale, after public advertisement, where the property or the major portion of it is situated, to the highest bidder who shall be an American citizen. That is the broad rule that we lay down as being the policy that ought to be and shall be followed in all these cases where there is not some compelling reason otherwise. But, having laid down that general principle, we provide that the President, for reasons stated, shall have the right to order the disposition of this property by private sale or otherwise—

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. In a moment. And we further provide that after the sale has been made the Alien Property Custodian may upon order of the President set aside such sale for reasons stated, and subsequently the property may be sold by public sale or otherwise, as the President may direct. In other words, we state as the judgment of the Congress that the property, unless there be special reasons to the contrary, when sold, shall be publicly sold, but we give to the President the power in the interest of the Nation to declare that it shall be disposed of otherwise when in his judgment it is necessary so to do in order to protect national interests. Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I wanted to ask the gentleman about the cases referred to—the sale of the Hamburg docks.

Mr. SHERLEY. I should have stated that where the sale is to the United States Government it does not require that it be a public sale.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It can negotiate directly?

Mr. SHERLEY. Unquestionably; and manifestly where the Government is to buy there is no reason why there should be a requirement of a public sale, when the Government would be compelled to bid against others in order to acquire property it might need and does need for war purposes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The first amendment relates exclusively to the taking over of the docks, piers, warehouses, wharves, and terminal equipment and facilities on the Hudson River now owned by the North German Lloyd Dock Co. and the Hamburg-American Terminal & Navigation Co., two corporations of the State of New Jersey, and so forth. The second amendment relates to the trading-with-the-enemy act, approved last October.

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That relates to the Alien Property Custodian and what he may or may not do with property of which he is the custodian.

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; it changes existing law in this particular, that under existing law he is permitted to sell property to prevent waste, and under the amendment as agreed to he is permitted to sell property as if he were the absolute owner—in other words, to sell any property that comes into his hands, but to sell it in the manner provided.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Now, would the Alien Property Custodian under that second amendment have the power to sell these Hamburg docks?

Mr. SHERLEY. Unquestionably. He has them in his possession and control and has had them for months.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I call attention to this language of the first amendment:

That if any such property—

That is, docks, wharves, and so forth—

shall be taken over as aforesaid, the United States shall make just compensation therefor, to be determined by the President.

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. "Upon the taking over of said property by the President, as aforesaid, the title for all such property so taken over shall immediately vest in the United States."

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Now, can that property be sold to the United States if it already has a vested title?

Mr. SHERLEY. Because the gentleman does not make a distinction between the title the Alien Property Custodian has under the law and the title the United States will get under purchase. The Alien Property Custodian under the law that we passed is authorized and directed to take over alien property which he holds as a common-law trustee.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I understand.

Mr. SHERLEY. Without a fee title to it; but under this, when the President shall have bought this property and taken it over, the fee-simple title in that property vests in the United States Government.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Well, if that is so, that the fee-simple title is in the United States immediately upon taking over property by the President under the provisions of the first section, how can the Alien Property Custodian under the provisions of the second amendment sell property to the United States to which it already has fee-simple title?

Mr. SHERLEY. Except that you make a premise that does not exist. The Alien Property Custodian has not the fee-simple title now.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The United States has.

Mr. SHERLEY. The United States has not. It is in these corporations. The control of the property is in the Alien Property Custodian. Under the second amendment, as such custodian he has the right to sell as if he were the absolute owner, and he does sell to the United States, which under the first amendment is authorized to buy and, when it buys, get a fee-simple title.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I confess I do not exactly understand that myself.

Mr. SHERLEY. I assure the gentleman that the matter has not been dealt with blindly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I presume it has not.

Mr. SHERLEY. It has not been done without regard to the questions of law involved.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If the Alien Property Custodian under the provisions of the law approved last October, known as the "trading-with-the-enemy" act, already has the custody of those docks, wharves, and so forth, and under the second amendment already has the power to sell to the United States, why was it necessary to have this first amendment, authorizing the President to take it and secure at once the fee-simple title?

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, it was thought desirable to expressly authorize the President to acquire these particular properties. The second amendment is very much more far-reaching and wider than the first.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Well, I know; but if he already has the power to sell it to the United States there was no reason whatever for giving to the President the power to take the fee-simple title right off himself.

Mr. SHERLEY. He does not take the fee-simple title right off himself. He gets it when he shall have acquired the property, either by concrete sale by the Alien Property Custodian or by taking the property and making just compensation therefor.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The language of the first amendment is this:

Provided, That if such property can not be procured by purchase, then the President is authorized and empowered to take over for the United States the immediate possession and title thereof—

Without any regard to the custodian.

Mr. SHERLEY. Suppose we do. When we have allowed him to take the property of American citizens when he needed to, shall we refuse to give him the power to take the property of alien enemies of the country? [Applause.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do not see why gentlemen are applauding anything except the emphasis the gentleman gave to his reply. It did not meet the point I have made here.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will make his inquiries in my time instead of commenting upon my answers, perhaps I can satisfy him.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I did not comment upon the answer. I commented upon the applause. I made no comment upon the answer.

Mr. SHERLEY. All right.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It was very eloquent, indeed, and I thought not entirely responsive.

Mr. SHERLEY. That explains the applause.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Now, then, the point I wish specifically to make is this: The first amendment in express terms authorizes the President, without any regard to the custodian, to take over that property, the immediate possession or title thereof, and when he does that, instantly, by the provisions of the same amendment, the title to that property is absolutely vested in the United States. And yet in the second paragraph they say that the Alien Property Custodian can proceed to sell that to any person that he pleases. It seemed to me upon the face of the two provisions that there was a contradiction. That is all.

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman from Kentucky yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will.

Mr. WALSH. In reference to the last query propounded by the gentleman, of course, where property is specifically mentioned in the first section, any other legislation of a general character would not annul the specific legislation.

Mr. SHERLEY. But it is inconceivable that an Alien Property Custodian, the appointee of the President, controlled by him, would undertake to dispose of property to somebody other than the Government of the United States when the Congress of the United States says that it will be bought by the President for the United States.

Mr. WALSH. Now, may I ask the gentleman under what conditions, if he feels it is proper to state, would it properly arise whereby the President might decree that in the public interest the property should not be sold at public sale?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will answer the gentleman without undertaking to name specific cases, though I think they could be named. Here is a certain industry owned 10 per cent, or 20 per cent, or 30 per cent by naturalized American citizens, with 60 or 70 or 80 per cent owned by German citizens, all of the capital in the first instance having been practically German. That minority interest might, and in many instances probably would, be in a position to bid most for the property, knowing both its value and also being practically bidding for the interests that were there in the first instance. The purchaser would be technically an American citizen, and yet his money come from and his heart be in Germany. We have scriptural warrant for the saying that where a man's treasure is there is his heart also. In such a case it would be in Germany and not in the United States. It might be highly desirable that the sale should not be permitted to go to such minority interest.

There is even another case that is conceivable that is not related to the question of aliens and alien enemies. There might be a purchase of some of these corporations which represent great dominant influences in certain trades by their large rivals in business that would give to them, if they got possession of the property, a complete monopoly, and it might not be desirable in the interest of the public that that should occur.

There is in this morning's paper a statement touching an alien-enemy corporation owning large sugar properties in the Hawaiian Islands, and the statement—I do not know how accurate it may be—is to the effect that an effort had been made, which was circumvented by the Alien Property Custodian, for the transfer of that property to certain American citizens so as to prevent the taking over of the properties and subsequent sale by the Alien Property Custodian. Suppose that particular property, assuming the statements in the papers are true, should be put up for sale and the purchaser should be the minority American interest, which is American in name only.

It would be the height of folly to permit a sale to take place and that property to come back into the possession of the people who would be operating it simply until the time when they might again give to German citizens and the German Government the influence and control which such ownership carries with it.

Mr. WALSH. Now, just a further question. I agree with the statements of the gentleman, but I thought that an explanation ought to be part of the record. Of course, the second amendment which the gentleman has been discussing does not make it compulsory?

Mr. SHERLEY. It does not.

Mr. WALSH. And certain businesses which are manufacturing things necessary for the war—they can be carried on, I assume, by the Alien Property Custodian if he deems it advisable?

Mr. SHERLEY. That is true.

Mr. WALSH. Under the second amendment?

Mr. SHERLEY. That is true, and of course there is certain property coming into his hands where manifestly there is no reason for the sale. There have come into his hands, for example, stocks in United States companies, in the aggregate representing millions of value. Some German owns certain

shares of stock, we will say, in the Pennsylvania Railroad, or in the United States Steel Co., or in the Illinois Central Railroad, or any other of the great corporations of the country. There is no reason in the world for the selling of that stock. It could be held, and the dividends as they accrue, if they should accrue, turned into the Treasury of the United States, and at the end of the war such disposition of that property could be made as will result from the final adjustment of the claims of the two Governments. But there are many going concerns that are enemy owned, either partially or entirely, many of them representing dominant influences in certain commercial lines. For this country to sit quiet and permit that control to continue; aye, even more than that, to have the Government's own custodian take charge of them, have them expand by virtue of the very war that Germany has forced upon us, and have these people safeguarded in their property, and at the end of the war that they had forced upon this country have that property turned back, greatly enhanced in value and in size, would be so idiotic that it is inconceivable that any people would contemplate it for a moment of time. [Applause.]

Mr. WALSH. The second amendment also changes the trading-with-the-enemy act in another particular by providing a penalty for the undisclosed principal?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. We undertake to safeguard the matter not only by giving the President the power to provide for sale other than public but we also provide a very severe penalty for any person buying for an undisclosed principal, or for resale to a person not a citizen of the United States, or for the benefit of a person not a citizen of the United States, with a provision also for the forfeiture of the property.

Now, I ought to say, before turning from these important amendments, that in regard to the first amendment there was presented a very interesting situation, one of great hardship to the city of Hoboken. These terminal properties paid annual taxes to the city of Hoboken of about \$140,000. By virtue of their coming into the ownership of the United States they will not be subject to that tax, and the loss at this time of \$140,000 of annual revenue to the city of Hoboken is a very severe loss. It was urged, and strongly urged, by my colleague [Mr. EAGAN], the gentleman from New Jersey, who represents that city, that provision should be made to enable the city to continue to collect taxes from such property; that these properties perhaps differed from usual Government property in that they were properties that could and would be used in a commercial way, and that the municipality ought not to be penalized by virtue of the Government taking them over. I do not think there was a man on the conference but was impressed with the equity that underlaid the argument that was so ably presented by the gentleman, but to have acquiesced in it meant to establish a precedent so far-reaching that we felt that we were not warranted in acquiescing, even if the rules controlling conferees had permitted us, which they did not. If this Government shall ever take over all of the railroads of America it would be presented with the problem in a very acute form as to what provision should be made permitting States and political subdivisions of a State to obtain revenues heretofore obtained from taxation of such property. Manifestly we did not feel that we had the right to undertake to solve that in a conference without any previous expression of a judgment by Congress on the subject.

I mention this because it is only fair to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EAGAN], who, in signing this report, has given an exhibition of a Member's ability to look beyond his district and look to the Nation's need rather than simply hold the local viewpoint. [Applause.] The need of the Government in taking this property was great, and he was big enough not to be willing to let a local situation, acute as it was, interfere with him in aiding in the doing of this important national work.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. AUSTIN. On page 64 provision is made for temporary office buildings in the District of Columbia, one item being \$5,775,000, on page 65.

Mr. SHERLEY. I would say to the gentleman that the only change made in the building program was to authorize the department, if it saw fit, to avail itself of heat furnished commercially rather than to create its own heating plant.

Mr. AUSTIN. I was out of the city when the bill passed the House originally. I wanted to ask the gentleman as to these two items, one being \$5,775,000 and the other being \$2,377,500. What profits are paid to the contractors for constructing these

buildings, which I understand were commenced before this bill passed the Senate?

Mr. SHERLEY. I can not answer the gentleman. I understand the frame buildings in Henry Park are to be built by the War Department directly without the interposition of any contractor. I do not know the terms on which the contract has been made touching the building of the concrete buildings at Seventeenth and B Streets.

Mr. AUSTIN. My understanding or information is that the Government is to pay for the cost of labor and material and \$250,000 to the contractor.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is possibly so.

Mr. AUSTIN. I wanted to know whether that embraced all that they were to receive for their work?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will say to the gentleman that the answer to that will depend upon the terms of the contract, and that I have no personal knowledge of it. I know in a general way, from talk with Commander Parsons, that he contemplated the building of these buildings through the assistance of a contractor. I have seen, at Seventeenth and B Streets, some temporary frame buildings that are being put up there by a contractor who, I assume, is the contractor who is going to build these buildings.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does not the Committee on Appropriations know anything at all about what the Government is paying for this work?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will answer the question. I am glad he has made the inquiry. There is probably close to a billion dollars worth of contract work under way or to be taken up shortly. The Committee on Appropriations could not, if it worked 24 hours a day all the time and did nothing else, follow and undertake to pass judgment upon the wisdom or lack of wisdom with which various contracts are let or the terms of such contracts. Now, I say that because the gentleman has touched on a question infinitely bigger than the reason for his inquiry and infinitely bigger than the question as to these buildings.

I believe that the time has come, and I have so stated to responsible heads in the War Department and elsewhere, when the War Department ought to be in a position to perform a lot of work directly without the interposition of contractors. As to whether that is wise or not, men will differ, and men do differ, but it seems to me that that was true as to that character of building which was simple and ordinary and concerning which the department has now had considerable experience. When the war broke they did not have the organization to enable them to do such work, but they ought now to have the organization that would enable them in many instances to do it, and they ought not to pay out money to contractors where contractors are not needed. There is work of some kind where the use of contractors will probably be both necessary and desirable, in the interest of both speed and economy.

Touching these particular concrete buildings, I am not prepared to say that it is not the part of wisdom, having in mind the desire to get them speedily and to get them cheaply, to pay an organization that has had experience in the building of similar work a fee for supervising such work. Now, the price fixed, in my judgment, prevents any great waste of money. We provided for buildings of a size that would make a total cost of \$3 a square foot. Before arriving at that opinion we had the judgment of the Army, of the Navy, of the Superintendent of the Capitol, and of Treasury officials as to cost; and their figures, as I stated, and as the gentleman would have heard me state if he had been here when the bill was up, ran from \$2.50 to \$3.09 a square foot, dependent somewhat on the character of the foundations that might have to be made. I understand that the gentleman has learned—because it came to me through another gentleman—that there was some contractor who claimed that he could build concrete buildings for \$1.50 a square foot. If he can, I bid him Godspeed, because he will be doing something that nobody else has ever done for this kind of building, as far as I have been able to learn. I am not a builder and I have to take the advice of the men who ought to know. Now, I would be glad if some of the legislative committees would undertake to function instead of criticize and would provide a rule as to how money should be expended in connection with the building program of the Government. The Committee on Appropriations will welcome such legislation. But I suggest to those who draw it that they will find something of a problem in making a rule which will bind and which will not also prevent.

Mr. AUSTIN. May I say a word or two?

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman may ask me a question in my time.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have not criticized the committee.

Mr. SHERLEY. I did not say the gentleman had.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has reported a bill here which I think goes further than this bill or any other bill in protecting the interests of the Government in requiring that this work shall be given out on a competitive basis. There is no safeguard in any of these bills so far.

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; there is. There is a price fixed.

Mr. AUSTIN. In this bill?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And in the public-building bill, too.

Mr. AUSTIN. As to the contractor who offered to do the work for \$1.50. I had no talk with him.

Mr. SHERLEY. I know the gentleman had not.

Mr. AUSTIN. But a Member of this House did, and he said this man came to him with the strongest indorsements as to reliability and efficiency, and that he offered to do it for \$1.50, and that we were paying \$3.

Mr. SHERLEY. If he can do it. I hope he will get an opportunity to do it. I will say to the gentleman, further, that it is absolutely impossible for either the committee or for Congress by legislation so to safeguard the expenditures of these huge sums as to prevent extravagance at times, desirable as it is to prevent it. I can not do it. In all the matters that the committee has had to deal with it has tried to get all the information it can. When it brings the bills to this floor it gives all the information it has. After the bills have become laws, the responsibility must rest with the administrative officers, and in these particular cases I do not think there is any liability of any great amount of extravagance, because the price was fixed after an investigation which showed what the price would probably be.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does the gentleman know whether in this instance that I am giving him, of the Government building where the contractor was given a contract which gave him \$250,000 profit for three or four months' work, any other reliable contractor in the United States was asked whether he would do it for less money?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not know; but I have no doubt that the Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Navy Department, having had considerable experience as to cost, and having control over the cost as they will have control over this, and desiring to build the building within the time necessary and within the limit of cost necessary, chose people who they thought were responsible and capable. I had nothing to do, as I will never have anything to do, with the suggestion of any human being for any contractual relationship with the Government. The responsibility is with the Navy Department. If the gentleman has a quarrel with what has been done, his quarrel rests with the Navy Department.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am asking this for information—

Mr. SHERLEY. I have no doubt that they will be able to give good and substantial reasons for any action that they have taken.

Mr. AUSTIN. The reason I asked the gentleman whether the contractors were to have more than \$250,000 profit was that it was stated that if they succeeded in constructing the buildings for less than a certain fixed amount they were to have an additional fee for their services, and I wanted some information, and naturally thought the committee dealing with this matter and reporting the appropriation could give us some. If the gentleman does not know of any means or method by which we can protect the interests of the Government against these exorbitant prices for this work, very good.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman mixes up assumptions with statements of facts that make his conclusions totally illogical. He says exorbitant fees. The gentleman assumes that a fee of \$250,000 for the construction of buildings of this character within a certain time that will cost about \$5,000,000 is an extravagant fee. I deny on the face of it that it is an extravagant fee. If it is an unnecessary fee, it ought not to be paid, but the assumption that the gentleman makes I submit has not yet been supported by anything more than his statement.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, if the Committee on Appropriations would say to these departments that are getting this money "you must submit the proposition to more than one reliable contractor and have competitive bids," it would be done.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will say to the gentleman that I have not only gone to the heads of the departments but I have gone further and oftener than the gentleman or any gentleman he can name to various officials of this Government to safeguard public expenditures whenever I learned of anything that warranted me in doing so. I can not take idle rumor and make it the basis of representations, and no other man with any appreciation of responsibility of office and of the tremendous tasks that

we are dealing with now could do so; but if the gentleman at any time will bring to me any detailed statement of facts I will guarantee to see to it that it comes to the immediate attention of the responsible officials of the Government.

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not challenge or question the gentleman's sincerity or his splendid work in reducing expenditures, for we all know—

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, let us dispense with the compliments.

Mr. AUSTIN. That he favors economy and reduction of public expenditures; but I do not think I am giving offense by in this public manner—

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman could not be offensive.

Mr. AUSTIN. Suggesting to this committee that has the handling of the money of the taxpayers that we might reduce the enormous expenses growing out of the construction of these buildings by having competitive bids or propositions from contractors; and there are many of them all over this country who have been here to Washington appealing to the Members of this House to give them an opportunity to bid on some of these propositions, and they have gone home without having that opportunity.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is quite true; and much of the criticism has been from men who did not get contracts because other people did. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I used?

Mr. BURNETT. Did they have any opportunity?

Mr. SHERLEY. They ought to have a chance, of course, if they are responsible people. How much time have I used?

The SPEAKER. Forty-nine minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 30 minutes additional time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that he may have 30 minutes additional time. Is there objection?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Can no other Member of the House get an opportunity for a few minutes to express his views on this bill without the consent of the gentleman in charge?

Mr. SHERLEY. He can not do it in my hour.

The SPEAKER. He can not as long as the gentleman's hour lasts, and if it is extended to an hour and a half the same conditions apply.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. After that will there be then opportunity?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman does not move the previous question, the matter can be debated indefinitely.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman consent that I have a very few minutes at the conclusion of his time?

Mr. SHERLEY. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. GILLET. Does not the gentleman intend to yield any time?

Mr. SHERLEY. Unquestionably I do. I did not want to take half the time that I have consumed, but I have tried to yield to questions of any gentleman on the floor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky that his time be extended for 30 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERLEY. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I would like to have about 15 minutes—or 10 minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. I shall yield the gentleman 10 minutes in a few moments.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Kentucky yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to make an inquiry in connection with Senate amendment No. 44, which is substantive legislation.

Mr. SHERLEY. I was coming to that just when I asked for the time. Amendment 44 is an amendment authorizing the payment of claims for property lost by officers, enlisted men, and female nurses of the Army. As originally proposed by the Senate it was very much broader than as it was agreed to in conference. The House conferees insisted upon the amendment going out, believing it could more properly await action of the Military Committees of the House and Senate. The Senate conferees insisted and persisted upon its remaining in the bill. The Senate Committee on Military Affairs had reported such a bill and it had been put on in the Senate in accordance with their rules. A similar bill was pending before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House and the conferees finally agreed to the provision with a limitation that narrowed it, and instead of the provision as it left the Senate providing for the repayment either in money or in kind of all the property that officers or

enlisted men or nurses were required to have and which might be lost under circumstances enumerated it now provides for the reimbursement in money or in property of only such property as they are required to have in the field service, restricting it in that regard. It also eliminated one of the cases, which was that the property should be reimbursed whenever the loss was without fault or negligence on the part of the owner. We provided it should be reimbursed whenever it was without fault or negligence on the part of the owner in the three cases set forth in the report.

Mr. STAFFORD. Was it the purpose of the conferees to limit this reimbursement for property lost by the enlisted force in the Army to the war alone?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; and it is limited to the war.

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, the only limitation I find of that character is next to the last paragraph, which, after the prior language, would lead me to believe it was to continue for all time.

Mr. SHERLEY. It was not so intended. What happened was the Senate undertook to amend the present law which relates to the payment of claims in peace times by making it apply both to peace and war times and making it very much wider. We did not change that statute at all, but we limited this to the cases enumerated, and in the limitation of the time when claims can be presented it is provided that claims must be made within one year after the claim arises, or made within six months after peace. That necessarily limits it to the war, and then we also limit it to property which they are required to have in field service.

Mr. STAFFORD. So virtually that limitation is in effect during the existence of the pending war, that this authority shall be granted for the payment of these claims?

Mr. SHERLEY. That is my understanding. I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DALLINGER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky why the appropriation of \$100,000 for the Watertown arsenal was stricken out of the bill?

Mr. SHERLEY. It was stricken out because it related to some offices at Watertown that we felt we could get fuller information about and come to a better judgment on in connection with the estimates of the sundry civil bill, and that is a bill that will necessarily come on the statute books within two or three months, and it was not such an emergency as to warrant us in carrying it at this time.

Mr. DALLINGER. It does not mean—

Mr. SHERLEY. It does not mean we either approve or disapprove of the item.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. ROWE. With reference to the other item, amendment No. 44 to the Senate bill, why was not that made to apply to commissioned officers and men in the Navy as well as in the Army?

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, they have a law of their own, and then the Senate put this on, and we could not have added a provision as to the Navy as a germane amendment.

Mr. ROWE. There seems to me a good deal more complaint in my section of the country in reference to losses by men in the Navy.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is a matter that should address itself to the Committee on Naval Affairs. We have no jurisdiction of it.

Mr. EAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the urgent deficiency bill, as it passed the House, as explained by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], was amended in one very important respect. The first amendment authorized the President to acquire the title to the docks, piers, warehouses, wharves, and terminal equipment and facilities now owned by the North German Lloyd Dock Co. and the Hamburg-American Line Terminal & Navigation Co., in Hoboken, if he shall deem it necessary for the national security and defense, provided that if such property can not be procured by purchase the President is authorized to take over for the United States the immediate possession and title thereof. Upon the taking over of the property by the President, the title to the property shall immediately vest in the United States.

I feel that I should call the attention of the House more explicitly to the effect that that will have on the city of Hoboken. The gentleman from Kentucky said it would mean a loss of \$140,000 in taxes. It will be nearer to \$150,000, and coming at this time it will work very great hardship on the city, due to the fact that by the operation of the half-mile prohibitory zone the city of Hoboken will lose next year in excise taxes about \$125,000 additional. Four-fifths of the saloons of the city are within the prohibited area and a good many of them have

already been closed, and the city expects to lose practically all of that revenue next year.

In addition to that, Hoboken will lose a very substantial amount—the exact amount can not be figured now—in the taxable value of the properties in which those saloons are located, so that all in all Hoboken will be placed in a most embarrassing position.

I did my utmost in the conference committee to provide some remedy for Hoboken, but without success. I do not know whether any remedy can yet be found, but I submit that it will be a very great injustice to Hoboken if some way can not be found whereby the city may continue to receive the taxes on these docks. Were it not for the fact that many of the items carried in this urgent deficiency bill bear directly on the prosecution of the war, I should have refused to agree to the conference report.

This amendment was put on as a rider to the urgent deficiency bill in the Senate. No opportunity was afforded to the officials or citizens of Hoboken to be heard, and under the rules that govern conference committees no legislation could be effected in the conference.

The amount of money represented in the taxes paid by these steamship companies is about one-eighth of the total taxable revenues of the city from real estate taxes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EAGAN. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What is the property said to be worth?

Mr. EAGAN. The German steamship piers, buildings, and lands were assessed for taxation purposes in 1917 to the extent of about \$6,283,000, if I remember correctly. Our total ratables are about \$79,000,000. This property along the river front comprises about one-third of our entire water-front, and is probably the most valuable property in the city.

Hoboken is a thoroughly loyal city. It has done its full duty in the liberty-bond drives and in every war appeal that has been made to the American people, including the call to the colors. It feels particularly honored by being made the port of embarkation of our fighting forces in the great war in which we are now engaged. It is the last bit of American soil which the boys in khaki tread upon before embarking for France. It welcomed the taking over of these docks by Uncle Sam.

I submit that if this is to be not only a war measure but must be extended over into peace times as well, and the property owned for all time by the United States, some remedial legislation, some way must be found to provide the money that we are going to lose in taxes. Hoboken can not stand this loss. It will be a blow from which it may not be able to recover. Hoboken can not materially reduce its expenses. It is the most thickly settled city in America, probably in the world, and this imposes, of itself, a serious tax burden, especially for school purposes.

Hoboken has no means of substantially increasing its taxes, and its tax rate will be increased upward of 50 points by the loss of this revenue and by the loss in excise revenue that I referred to a moment ago.

Mr. MADDEN. What does the gentleman mean by "50 points"?

Mr. EAGAN. The rate is now \$23.20 per thousand, and the loss of this revenue and the excise revenues will mean that the remaining property of the city, exclusive of the steamship docks, will have to bear all of the tax burden.

Mr. MADDEN. About 1 per cent additional?

Mr. EAGAN. No; it is very much more than that. The German steamship docks and buildings paid nearly \$150,000 in taxes last year. The estimated loss in excise revenues will be about \$125,000, or \$275,000 in all. The total of the taxes of the city last year was about \$1,400,000. The loss in revenue from both of these sources amounts to about 20 per cent, and this loss will have to be borne by the remainder of the property in the city subject to taxation. As I have said before, Hoboken can not stand this great loss of revenue, and it must be given relief in some way, so far as the German docks are concerned. If this 20 per cent is added to the remaining property subject to taxation, it would make the tax rate about \$27.86 a thousand.

Mr. MADDEN. \$23 per capita?

Mr. EAGAN. \$23.20 per \$1,000 is now the tax rate.

Mr. MADDEN. That is \$2.32 per hundred?

Mr. EAGAN. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. "Fifty points" would mean that you would go up to almost \$2.80 a hundred, instead of \$2.32?

Mr. EAGAN. Yes; on the remaining property.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EAGAN. Yes.

Mr. NORTON. Has Hoboken any municipal docks?

Mr. EAGAN. No. Unfortunately we have not a foot of water-front property that belongs to the municipality.

Mr. NORTON. Could the city take over these docks and operate them?

Mr. EAGAN. The city would be very glad of the opportunity to take over the docks and lease them to the Federal Government at an agreed price that would represent its interest on the bonds and the amount that the city now receives in taxes. There is no objection whatever to the Federal Government taking over the property, but the city is not in a position to stand this drain. I submit it should not be put to such a great hardship and injury as this will entail.

Mr. NORTON. It occurred to me that the municipality might be able to operate the docks more efficiently than the Government at this time.

Mr. EAGAN. The municipality would be glad to do that, but it yields, of course, to the Federal Government.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EAGAN. Yes.

Mr. DEWALT. I suppose it is true that this property is always increasing in value. Would it not therefore be an increasing loss each year, because the rate would be the same and the property value greater?

Mr. EAGAN. That is so. During the last 10 years the assessed value of the property has increased about 100 per cent. Perhaps the property was undervalued for taxation purposes in the past, but the increase in the assessed valuation is due, in the main, I think, to the great increase in the value of this property. It is invaluable.

Now, Mr. Speaker. I ask leave to extend my remarks by the insertion of a telegram from Hon. P. R. Griffin, mayor of Hoboken, an editorial from the Hudson Observer, of Hoboken, and an editorial from the Hudson Dispatch, of Union Hill, N. J.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

HOBOKEN, N. J., March 16, 1918.

Hon. JOHN J. EAGAN,

Member of House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The city of Hoboken is very much opposed to the Government taking title to the German steamship piers, unless adequate provision is made for the protection of the city on the taxes. If the Government takes title, and thereby the taxes of the piers are lost, it will practically mean bankruptcy to the city. I would request that you arrange for a hearing and give Hoboken an opportunity to be heard. Wire me particulars if you please.

P. R. GRIFFIN,
Mayor of Hoboken.

[From Hudson Observer, of Hoboken, N. J., Mar. 22, 1918.]

A MOST SERIOUS PROBLEM NOW CONFRONTS THE TAXPAYERS OF HOBOKEN—TIME TO ACT.

What will the Government do to recompense Hoboken for the loss of taxes involved in the taking over of the piers and their permanent retention? The loss of \$150,000 a year in taxes on top of the shrinkage from liquor licenses certain to follow the continuation of the barred zone is a blow from which the whole city will stagger unless speedy methods of relief are found. Wiping out at one swoop 20 per cent of its ratables is just about the most serious blow any community can sustain.

In Hoboken's case the destruction is worse than that caused by a great fire, for in such a case the ground value remains and buildings may be replaced. But local taxation of Government-owned property is impossible, either directly or indirectly, and hence, so far as Hoboken's finances are concerned, the docks and piers are irretrievably wiped out.

The situation is unprecedented. No other city in the country ever has or probably ever will be called on to face its like. But it is distinctly a war emergency. The burden is cast upon Hoboken for the benefit of the entire country. Therefore, at least until Hoboken can be afforded ample opportunity to readjust itself to the changed conditions the problem is in effect a national problem and should be dealt with as such by the National Government which has created it. We do not know what form of assistance can be extended under the circumstances, but it must be given, and given quickly, in one way or another. The situation deserves and will doubtless have the prompt attention of the President. The entire New Jersey delegation in Congress should be prepared to act if remedial legislation is deemed advisable. It stands to reason that the United States Government will see that the situation is cleared up satisfactorily to the city. Mayor Griffin and the city commissioners should not delay action in the matter.

[From the Hudson Dispatch, of Union Hill, N. J., Mar. 23, 1918.]

THE TAXES ON HOBOKEN PIERS.

It would be outrageously unfair for the Government to take title to the valuable German piers in Hoboken, without making provision for the payment of taxes in full upon the property. Hoboken can not afford to lose \$150,000 taxes, and the Government has no right to expect the taxpayers of the city to make up such a deficit.

The exemption of the piers from taxation would be vastly different from the exemption of post offices. Every city and every municipality has a post office, which is exempt from taxation, so that it is about "even up" on that score.

But when it comes to steamship piers Hoboken would be carrying a burden which no other municipality in the land would carry for the Government. A city like Hoboken has to depend upon its valuable water-front property for a big share of its taxes, and any plan for the Government ownership of the piers should be predicated upon the payment of taxes upon them.

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the first of these amendments proposes new legislation; the second does not propose new legislation, but only to amend an existing law enacted last October and known as the trading-with-the-enemy act. I voted for the trading-with-the-enemy act, as did also, I believe, every other Member of the House who was present when the vote was taken, and I am prepared to vote for anything proper which will make it more effective. And therefore it is of course clear that I question the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. SHERLEY] about the legal purport of these two amendments during his opening speech, not because I was opposed to the trading-with-the-enemy act, or to its amendment, but because of the exceeding importance of his statement that the two amendments, if enacted into law, would permit the custodian of alien property, in his discretion, to sell certain wharves and docks in Hoboken belonging to two New Jersey corporations which are specifically named in the first amendment. Now, that, I think, is not a proper construction of the two amendments taken together. On the contrary, in my judgment, if these two amendments become law, the power to acquire the title to the property named in the first amendment will be vested exclusively in the President of the United States.

Before further discussing this point I desire briefly to remind gentlemen of the importance of water terminals, and to say that it is my strong belief that on grounds of high public policy the United States should not sell any of its wharf or dock property located on navigable waters. This, I believe, because of the constant embarrassing troubles which communities undergo through the private monopolization of water terminal facilities. I maintain that whenever the United States Government becomes the owner in fee of wharfage, dockage, or similar facilities on navigable streams or harbors, it never should absolutely relinquish that title.

This question is not a new one in Congress. Some years ago a bill was introduced in the House which proposed to give the Government the right to sell virtually at private sale wharves and docks which it owned in the harbor of San Juan in Porto Rico. That bill was opposed and defeated on the floor. A few years earlier an attempt was made to sell wharfage and docks which the Government owned in Alaska. That provision was in a bill favorably reported here, but when brought to the attention of the House it was defeated. Now, I think, at least I hope, that the President will construe this amended bill so that the first Senate amendment will mean that he, the President, shall have the exclusive authority to acquire the title to and to control the Hoboken wharfage and other property here in question. This, I hope, in part also, because of the predicament in which Hoboken may soon find herself. If necessary, the President might be empowered, in behalf of the National Government, to lease the docks and other property to that municipality for a time, or perhaps until after this war is over and normal conditions shall be restored, or perhaps with the privilege—though this I do not urge—of buying the property at a certain figure, on an amortization plan, so much each year for interest and so much for payment of an installment on the principal, and with a provision that if Hoboken ever should attempt to sell the property the title should thereupon immediately revert to the Government of the United States.

But the only really sound policy is for the Government not to sell any of its water terminals. That is a forward-looking view to take of a problem now being presented to the business interests of this country everywhere, but with especial force wherever there is a monopolization of such terminal facilities, and the consequent power to dictate to manufacturers and other shippers. It is, and for years has been, one of the most important business problems before the American people—this question of the control of transportation terminal facilities.

I now ask the attention of gentlemen to the language of this first amendment:

The President is authorized to acquire the title to the docks, piers, warehouses, wharves, and terminal equipment and facilities on the Hudson River now owned by the North German Lloyd Dock Co. and the Hamburg-American Line Terminal & Navigation Co., two corporations of the State of New Jersey, if he shall deem it necessary for the national security and defense: *Provided*, That if such property can not be procured by purchase, then the President is authorized and empowered to take over for the United States the immediate possession and title thereof.

The President will not have to wait for a jury. He himself can take and pay for the property, and thereupon the title instantly will vest in the United States. He can alone fix the amount to be paid as compensation.

If any such property shall be taken over as aforesaid, the United States shall make just compensation therefor, to be determined by the President. Upon the taking over of said property by the President, as aforesaid, the title to all such property so taken over shall immediately vest in the United States.

This first amendment, when enacted, will be new legislation. And this new legislation will relate exclusively to certain property—docks, wharves, and so forth—therein specifically described. Now, this property, so specifically described, is property which was previously included in the provisions of the trading-with-the-enemy act approved in October last, but only in general terms. In that act of last October there is no specific mention of these particular wharves and other property. On the contrary, as I have said, the provisions of that act apply to all alien enemy property and are general in character. And, therefore, in so far as that act of last October may be held to include in its general terms this property in Hoboken, it is now, as to that property, to be entirely repealed by this first amendment, which makes new and complete provisions concerning that property, and in express, specific terms. Under the trading-with-the-enemy act power over all the property of all alien enemies is given in general language to the Custodian of Alien Property, but under this first amendment power over certain particular pieces of such property belonging to certain of these alien enemies is in specific language given to the President, and to him alone.

In other words, the first amendment, in clear, specific terms, takes the particular property in Hoboken out from under the general language of the trading-with-the-enemy act, and therefore repeals that act in so far as it relates to that particular property.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. Certainly it ought not to be considered the intention of Congress to give the Custodian of Alien Property the right to sell this property in the city of Hoboken to any corporation, any steamboat company which already may have abundant wharfage facilities, and may desire to acquire this Hoboken property to help enable it to secure a monopoly of terminal facilities.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. If the property is owned in part by loyal American owners, what would the gentleman say as to the constitutionality of these proceedings?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I understand it is owned by two New Jersey corporations, the stockholders of which are Germans and alien enemies. Nevertheless, the corporations are both New Jersey corporations, and the dealings would be had with New Jersey corporations, artificial beings, acting through their officers.

And the title to be taken over would be the title of the corporation, not the title of the individual stockholders.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I would not wish the custodian of alien property to have power to sell this property to some steamship company which already in the city of New York has abundant dock facilities. And yet he will have that power if the construction is that the first amendment does not confer upon the President exclusive jurisdiction respecting the property in Hoboken. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DEWALT. The trading-with-the-enemy act provides that the Alien Custodian can take stock of any alien enemy in any corporation.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Is a New Jersey corporation an alien enemy?

Mr. DEWALT. No, no; but if the stock of the corporation, and whether it be a New Jersey or a Pennsylvania corporation makes no difference, is owned by an alien enemy, and an alien enemy is one who resides in alien territory, then that stock can be taken by the Alien Custodian. So here the remedy would be for the Alien Property Custodian to take the stock, and he would have the voting power of the stock naturally as he had the stock; but that would not necessarily give him title to the real estate. He would only have the stock.

Mr. SHERLEY. And if the gentleman would permit, he has had the stock for months.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But the first amendment authorizes and empowers the President of the United States to

take over the specifically described Hoboken property of two corporations.

This means all of the property of the corporations—stock and everything else. He can take it, regardless of the wishes of the custodian of alien property. The first amendment expressly authorizes the President to do this. It does not leave it to inference.

Mr. GRAY of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. GRAY of New Jersey. Does not the gentleman remember that the United States Government has taken over all of the rest of the property of these corporations without the consideration that the gentleman had in mind, namely, the ships belonging to them, for which these terminal facilities were secured?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But the gentleman mistakes the point under discussion. The law of last October gave, in general terms, the custodian the right to take over all of the property of all alien enemies. Here is a new section to be enacted now—in March, 1918—taking out in express terms from the general provisions of the trading-with-the-enemy act of last October certain specific property, which it names, and giving complete authority over it to the President. Therefore that property thus named is taken out of the jurisdiction of the custodian of alien property.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. STEELE. This is a new, specific authority to condemn, regardless of the trading-with-the-enemy act of last October.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Repeals by implication are not favored in the law. That is the ordinary rule of statutory construction. But it is true also that in this instance we have what is equivalent to a repeal in express terms, because, as I said a moment ago, the act of October, 1917, in general terms, gives authority over all the property of all alien enemies to the Custodian of Alien Property, while the pending first amendment gives authority over certain portions of this property belonging to certain specifically named alien enemies to the President.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I sincerely hope that the President will thus construe the law and take immediate possession of those wharves and other property up there. That, in my judgment, would be the true way to solve this problem. The two amendments ought not to be so construed as to permit the Custodian of Alien Property to sell it at public or private sale to some corporation which now already has great wharfage facilities in New York and that will pay three times the value of the property in order to own and control it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman object to the Congress providing for the acquisition of this specific property through legislation such as this, rather than leaving it to the Alien Property Custodian?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. No. The gentleman misunderstands me.

Mr. WALSH. That is all this amendment does.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. WALSH. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall detain the House only a few moments longer.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has only one minute remaining.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman from Illinois will yield me additional time?

Mr. CANNON. I yield the gentleman such time as he desires.

Mr. SHERLEY. I shall not want more than 10 minutes. I shall not detain the House unnecessarily, and would not at all if it had not been for the statements made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER]. I am just as anxious as he is, and I am sure the President of the United States is as anxious as he is, that this property shall neither go back into the hands of former German owners, nor go into the hands of any private monopolistic control. The very purpose of this provision, put in at the suggestion of the President himself, was in order that the United States Government might acquire with the idea of keeping, these terminals at Hoboken and not with the idea of having the Alien Property Custodian sell them to anybody else.

Now, the sole effect of the first amendment is to give plainly the right, first to the President to negotiate and purchase, and failing, if it be conceivable that he could fail, dealing with the Alien Property Custodian—failing negotiations for the purchase, the right to take. That is the plain meaning of it, and he who runs may read. Now, there is no better way I know of to assure the thing that the gentleman has in mind than what we have provided.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Not now. Now, the second amendment was an amendment introduced not simply because of the Hoboken docks, but introduced for all alien property in order to correct an omission in the original alien property act, to give to the Alien Property Custodian the right to sell for any cause and not simply the right to sell to prevent waste, which is the way the law now reads which is upon the statute book. Now, what will happen will be this: The President will negotiate with the Alien Property Custodian for the purchase of these properties. Failing to arrive at an agreement he will take the property under the power that is given, and if he does take the properties by the very terms of the act authorizing him to take them he must make just compensation and the title vests in the United States, and having vested in the United States I hope it will not be given or sold to the city of Hoboken or to anybody. I hope it will always remain the property of the United States, and that is the intention of the provision, and there is no amount of construction that can change the plain meaning of this particular section.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Just a question.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The reason I took the floor a moment ago was that I understood the gentleman to say, in reply to my question earlier to-day, that the second amendment—the one which amends the "trading-with-the-enemy act," approved in October last—authorized the Custodian of Alien Property to sell these docks.

Mr. SHERLEY. Authorized him to sell all property that is in his possession as alien-property custodian.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The docks are in his custody, then can he sell the docks?

Mr. SHERLEY. He can and will to the United States.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman will yield, I do not think I understood the argument of the gentleman from Wisconsin. He was trying to provide against the danger, as I understood it, of the Alien Property Custodian selling these docks to some other corporation, but suppose the United States Government buys them, the title comes to the United States and thereupon he loses the right to sell to anybody else.

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course he does.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That takes them out of his custody.

Mr. SHERLEY. It is inconceivable that the alien-property custodian under the control of the President, appointed and removable by him at will, would sell or undertake to sell the property to some one other than the United States when the Congress has gone to the extent, at the instance of the President, of expressly providing that the President may buy them for the United States.

Mr. MADDEN. He could commandeer them if he wished.

Mr. SHERLEY. Not only has he the right to commandeer their use but this property is being controlled by the Government now and used in connection with its war purposes.

Mr. MADDEN. So when the disposition is made of these properties at Hoboken to the United States Government the custodian is out of the control of them entirely?

Mr. SHERLEY. Why, yes; what he will get is a certain amount of money as the purchase price for them, which he will turn over to the United States Treasury.

Mr. MADDEN. For a subsequent accounting?

Mr. SHERLEY. And have to account for it at the end of the war.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is exactly the construction which I hoped the gentleman will say is the correct one.

Mr. SHERLEY. I have never said anything else from the beginning. The gentleman misunderstood me, and what led the gentleman into error, if he will permit me, was this thought, that he keeps thinking of the second amendment as having been written simply in its relationship to the Hoboken property.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Oh, no.

Mr. SHERLEY. Whereas the second amendment was written for the purpose of affecting all property in the hands of the custodian.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The first amendment is new legislation and relates exclusively and specifically in its terms

to wharves and docks in Hoboken owned by two New Jersey corporations. I was not mistaken as to the facts. I simply misunderstood the gentleman from Kentucky this morning if he then said what he now says is the proper construction of these two amendments.

Mr. SHERLEY. There is no doubt. I know the matter originated with the President. I know his wishes; I know what we are intending to do here, and anybody who reads the section can have but one conclusion. The first section provides the United States may buy; the second section provides that the Alien Property Custodian may sell this or any other property that he has in his possession. The result will be that the title to this property will be turned over to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the report, and upon that I move the previous question.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit one question?

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman admitted by his last statement that the statute is not mandatory and that the custodian can sell or may sell to the highest bidder those wharves and docks, but he hopes that the custodian will sell them to the President.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not hope. I know he will.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Exactly; but I claim that under the best and proper construction it ought to be held that the first amendment confers exclusive power upon the President to acquire these docks and wharves, and that as to them there is no discretion left in the custodian.

Mr. SHERLEY. We do not need to waste any time. What the gentleman believes ought to be compelled I know will be done, and we might as well move on.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

PAYMENT OF INCOME TAX BY INSTALLMENTS.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman if it does not take over five minutes.

Mr. BARNHART. I send to the desk a letter, which I do not think will take over two minutes to read, from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue relative to the possibility of having the income tax paid by installments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 22, 1918.

Hon. HENRY A. BARNHART,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BARNHART: I have your favor of the 16th instant inclosing a letter from Mr. M. W. Mix, president Dodge Manufacturing Co., Mishawaka, Ind., in which he suggests that some plan be adopted for the payment in installments, throughout the year, of income and excess profits taxes due on June 15 next.

There is no provision of law under which this department may defer, beyond June 15, 1918, the payment of income and excess profits taxes, and the financial requirements of the Government are such as to make it unwise for this department to recommend to Congress at this time the enactment of legislation that will authorize the department to defer such payments beyond June 15.

The situation to which you have directed attention has been given most serious consideration. Such action has been taken to minimize the strain of sudden withdrawals as is permissible under existing laws; as, for example, Treasury Decision 2622 authorizes the partial payment, in advance, of income and excess profits taxes established to be due for the taxable year 1917, and Treasury Decision 2639 authorizes and directs the acceptance of Treasury certificates of indebtedness, at par and accrued interest, in payment of income and excess profits taxes due on June 15 next. About \$1,250,000,000 of certificates maturing in June and acceptable in payment of income and excess profits taxes have been issued and sold. This is about one-half of the estimated amount of those taxes.

I am strongly in favor of having the taxes paid in installments, but I think they ought to be paid in installments in advance, and that payment of taxes ought not to be deferred.

These devices will serve effectually, it is believed, to reduce the strain on financial institutions, and further relief may be afforded by taxpayers who will anticipate the necessity of paying their taxes and arrange their financial affairs accordingly.

Let me add that the passage of the war finance corporation bill will, I think, have considerable effect along certain lines in relieving any undue strain in connection with the payment of income and excess profits taxes.

Respectfully,

DANIEL C. ROPER,
Commissioner.

INCREASED PAY FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the postal salary bill, H. R. 9414.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House

on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9414.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point that there is no quorum present, and evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will close the doors; the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees. Those in favor of going into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union will, as their names are called, answer "yea" and those opposed will answer "nay," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 356, nays 1, not voting 74, as follows:

Alexander	Emerson	Kraus	Rouse
Almon	Esch	La Follette	Rowe
Anderson	Evans	Langley	Rubey
Anthony	Fairchild, B. L.	Larsen	Rucker
Ashbrook	Fairfield	Lazaro	Russell
Aswell	Farr	Lee, Ga.	Sabath
Austin	Ferris	Leibach	Sanders, Ind.
Ayres	Fields	Leshner	Sanders, La.
Bacharach	Fisher	Lever	Sanders, N. Y.
Baer	Flynn	Linthicum	Sanford
Bankhead	Focht	Little	Saunders, Va.
Barnhart	Foss	Lobeck	Scott, Iowa
Beakes	Foster	London	Scott, Mich.
Bell	Francis	Loneragan	Scully
Beshlin	Frear	Longworth	Sears
Black	Freeman	Lufkin	Sells
Bland	French	Lundeen	Shackleford
Blanton	Fuller, Ill.	Lunn	Shallenberger
Boober	Fuller, Mass.	McAndrews	Sherwood
Bowers	Gallagher	McArthur	Shouse
Britten	Gallivan	McClintic	Siegel
Browne	Garland	McCormick	Sims
Browning	Garner	McCulloch	Sinnett
Buchanan	Garrett, Tenn.	McFadden	Slayden
Burnett	Garrett, Tex.	McKenzie	Slemp
Burroughs	Gillett	McKeown	Sloan
Butler	Glynn	McKinley	Small
Byrnes, S. C.	Godwin, N. C.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith, Mich.
Byrns, Tenn.	Goodwin, Ark.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Snell
Campbell, Kans.	Gordon	McLemore	Snook
Campbell, Pa.	Graham, Ill.	Madden	Snyder
Candler, Miss.	Gray, Ala.	Macee	Stafford
Cannon	Gray, N. J.	Maher	Stegall
Cantrill	Green, Iowa	Mansfield	Stedman
Caraway	Greene, Mass.	Mapes	Steele
Carew	Greene, Vt.	Martin	Steenerson
Carter, Mass.	Gregg	Mason	Stephens, Miss.
Carter, Okla.	Griest	Mays	Stephens, Nebr.
Cary	Griffin	Merritt	Sterling, Ill.
Chandler, Okla.	Hadley	Mondell	Sterling, Pa.
Church	Hamilton, Mich.	Montague	Stevenson
Clark, Fla.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Moon	Stiness
Clark, Pa.	Hamlin	Moore, Pa.	Strong
Claypool	Hardy	Moores, Ind.	Sullivan
Cleary	Harrison, Va.	Morgan	Summers
Coady	Haskell	Morin	Sweet
Collier	Hastings	Mudd	Swift
Connally, Tex.	Haugen	Neely	Switzer
Connelly, Kans.	Hawley	Nelson	Tague
Cooper, W. Va.	Hayden	Nicholls, S. C.	Talbot
Cooper, Wis.	Heaton	Nichols, Mich.	Taylor, Ark.
Costello	Hedfin	Nolan	Taylor, Colo.
Cox	Helm	Norton	Temple
Crago	Helvering	Oldfield	Thompson
Cramton	Hensley	Oliver, Ala.	Tillman
Crisp	Hersey	Oliver, N. Y.	Tilson
Crosser	Hicks	Olney	Timberlake
Currie, Mich.	Hilliard	Osborne	Tinkham
Dale, N. Y.	Holland	O'Shaunessy	Townner
Dale, Vt.	Hood	Overstreet	Treadway
Dallinger	Houston	Padgett	Venable
Darrow	Howard	Palge	Vestal
Davis	Huddleston	Park	Vinson
Decker	Hull, Iowa	Parker, N. J.	Voigt
Delaney	Hull, Tenn.	Parker, N. Y.	Waldow
Dempsey	Humphreys	Peters	Walker
Denison	Husted	Phelan	Walton
Denton	Hutchinson	Platt	Wason
Dewalt	Igoe	Polk	Watkins
Dickinson	Ireland	Porter	Watson, Pa.
Dill	Jacaway	Pou	Watson, Va.
Dillon	James	Purnell	Weaver
Dixon	Johnson, Wash.	Quin	Welling
Dominick	Jones, Tex.	Rainey	Whaley
Donovan	Jones, Va.	Raker	Wheeler
Doolling	Juni	Ramsey	White, Me.
Doollittle	Keating	Ramseyer	White, Ohio
Doremus	Kelley, Mich.	Randall	Williams
Doughton	Kelly, Pa.	Rankin	Wilson, Ill.
Dowell	Kennedy, Iowa	Rayburn	Wilson, La.
Drane	Kennedy, R. I.	Reavis	Wilson, Tex.
Dunn	Kettner	Reed	Wingo
Dyer	Key, Ohio	Riordan	Winslow
Eagan	Kiess, Pa.	Robbins	Woods, Iowa
Eagle	Kincheloe	Robinson	Woodyard
Edmonds	King	Rodenberg	Wright
Elliot	Kinkaid	Rogers	Young, N. Dak.
Ellsworth	Kitchin	Romjue	Young, Tex.
Elston	Knutson	Rose	Zihlman

NAYS—1.

Walsh

NOT VOTING—74.

Barkley	Fairchild, G. W.	Kearns	Schall
Blackmon	Fess	Kehoe	Scott, Pa.
Borland	Flood	Kreider	Sherley
Brand	Fordney	LaGuardia	Sisson
Brodbeck	Gandy	Lea, Cal.	Smith, Idaho
Brumbaugh	Gard	Lenroot	Smith, C. B.
Caldwell	Glass	Littlepage	Smith, T. E.
Carlin	Good	Mann	Templeton
Chandler, N. Y.	Goodall	Meeker	Thomas
Classon	Gould	Miller, Minn.	Van Dyke
Clopper, Ohio	Graham, Pa.	Miller, Wash.	Vare
Coppley	Hamill	Mott	Volstead
Curry, Cal.	Harrison, Miss.	Overmyer	Ward
Davidson	Hayes	Powers	Webb
Dent	Heintz	Pratt	Welty
Dies	Hollingsworth	Price	Wise
Drukker	Johnson, Ky.	Ragsdale	Wood, Ind.
Dupré	Johnson, S. Dak.	Roberts	
Estopinal	Kahn	Rowland	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. BLACKMON with Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.
 Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH with Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD.
 Mr. OVERMYER with Mr. WARD.
 Mr. VAN DYKE with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. BORLAND with Mr. GOOD.
 Mr. GANDY with Mr. CURRY of California.
 Mr. THOMAS with Mr. DAVIDSON.
 Mr. BARKLEY with Mr. DRUKKER.
 Mr. BRAND with Mr. CARY.
 Mr. BRODBECK with Mr. GOODALL.
 Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. KREIDER.
 Mr. CALDWELL with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.
 Mr. CARLIN with Mr. MEEKER.
 Mr. GARD with Mr. HAYES.
 Mr. HAMILL with Mr. COOPER of Ohio.
 Mr. DENT with Mr. KAHN.
 Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi with Mr. MILLER of Minnesota.
 Mr. DIES with Mr. COPLEY.
 Mr. KEHOE with Mr. MILLER of Washington.
 Mr. DUPRE with Mr. GOULD.
 Mr. LEE of California with Mr. MOTT.
 Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. FESS.
 Mr. LITTLEPAGE with Mr. PRATT.
 Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. FORDNEY.
 Mr. PRICE with Mr. POWERS.
 Mr. SCHALL with Mr. ROBERTS.
 Mr. SHERLEY with Mr. TEMPLETON.
 Mr. SISSON with Mr. VOLSTEAD.
 Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH with Mr. SMITH of Idaho.
 Mr. WEBB with Mr. WOOD of Indiana.
 Mr. WELTY with Mr. ROWLAND.
 Mr. WISE with Mr. VARE.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9414, with Mr. CARAWAY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9414, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9414) granting increased compensation to certain officials, employees, and laborers in the Post Office Department and Postal Service, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. Under the rule adopted on March 21 two measures were made in order as parts of this bill. Both of those two measures have been considered by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and they both contain paragraphs which are headed as sections. In the rule as printed in the Record the sections are not numbered, but the various sections of each measure are grouped together and each group is paragraphed 1 and 2. My inquiry is, In considering parts of the bill, will they be considered by sections in each of the two parts or will they be considered as one section for each measure?

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, there is some doubt in my own mind as to whether under the rule the amendment that was offered, which contains two or three sections, can properly be considered as one section in the bill, and I will therefore change my amendment so that the sections in the bill will be considered in the order in which they appear and are numbered in the original bill. For instance, we will take up the section on the

motor trucks, and then the section on aviation, and then the proposition on the postal employees.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I was unfortunate enough not to have heard the gentleman's remarks when the bill was first taken up for consideration, and I do not know whether or not he devoted any considerable time to explaining these two bills that were made in order. Is it his intention to devote some time now to discussing or explaining the measures in a general way?

Mr. MOON. These two bills were put on in the Committee on Rules for the purpose of being considered with the main bill, H. R. 9414, as amended. We have completed the original bill and have come to the first amendment authorized by the Committee on Rules. In the bill as it was brought into the House and approved by the Committee on Rules the motor truck was the first section, and then the aviation section, and then came the independent section of the postal matter. I had moved to consider them all as one section, but if it is desired by the House to do otherwise—and it may be done more speedily that way—we can take them up one at a time.

Mr. STEENERSON. That is satisfactory.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman, I think, may have misunderstood my inquiry. I wished to inquire whether the gentleman now intends to make any remarks touching these two important measures in the nature of explanation or general debate, or whether he has heretofore done so?

Mr. MOON. I want the House to have a full explanation of this section. I have no objection to reasonable debate.

Mr. WALSH. My inquiry went more to the intention of the gentleman to make at this time more extended remarks on these two subjects.

Mr. MOON. I am going to offer an amendment to the first section, and then, with the consent of the House, I would like to have the statement of the department, which goes into detail in every particular, read.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. Before the chairman of the committee takes his seat, I think it will be understood, first, that these various paragraphs, including one in this and one in the other, ought to be separately numbered.

Mr. MOON. That is the suggestion I made.

Mr. TOWNER. Now, in order that that may be done and without changing the proposition as now presented, I think it would be proper for the chairman of the committee to ask that they be considered by unanimous consent as separate paragraphs.

Mr. MOON. That is what I asked. Mr. Chairman, I ask that these sections, all of them made in order to be introduced as amendments, be treated as sections.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the amendments, made in order by special rule, be offered as paragraphs, each paragraph treated as a section. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first section.

Mr. MOON. Let the Clerk report the motor-truck section first.

The CHAIRMAN. It was read for information yesterday, as the RECORD shows. It is being offered now for amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the Chair will permit, last evening the Clerk read the first paragraph and was about to read the second when he was interrupted by a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has just instructed the Clerk to read the first paragraph for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

That to promote the conservation of food products and to facilitate the collection and delivery thereof from producer to consumer and the delivery of articles necessary in the production of such food products to the producers, the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to conduct experiments in the operation of motor-vehicle truck routes in the vicinity of such cities of the United States as he may select, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, and the cost of such experiments, not exceeding \$300,000, may be paid by the Postmaster General out of any unexpended appropriations of the Postal Service, and the Postmaster General shall report the result of such experiments to the Congress at the earliest practicable date.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] has an amendment that he wanted to offer to the first section.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the first section. The lines in the bill are not the same as those in the amendment, but the Clerk will find, about the middle of the third line from the bottom of the page, the place where I offer this amendment. That is, after the word "service," insert the following: "Provided, That the Postmaster General may use the revenue derived from this experimental motor-vehicle truck

service to establish and maintain additional motor-vehicle truck routes, and to provide for the purchase of vehicles and operating expenses thereof."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOON: Insert after the word "service" the following: "Provided, That the Postmaster General may use the revenue derived from this experimental motor-vehicle truck service to establish and maintain additional motor-vehicle truck routes and to provide for the purchase of vehicles and operating expenses thereof."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee want to be heard on his amendment?

Mr. MOON. I hardly think it is necessary to be heard on it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I desire recognition in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. MOON. If there is any opposition to this amendment I want to say that this is purely an experimental service, that the department believes it will accomplish good results, and that instead of bringing a loss it will bring a substantial revenue to the Government. Of course the amount authorized for this experimental service is small. Standing alone it would accomplish good in proportion to the sum that is authorized, but the department suggests—and this amendment is a departmental suggestion—that for the extension of the service the revenues that may be derived from it may be used in the enlargement of the service for the benefit of the public. That will accomplish the desire of the department in trying to make effective a system by which the cities will be connected with the country and the country with the cities in the distribution of the products of the farm and of the merchandise from the cities, so that they will find it mutually beneficial.

There is a vast portion of our country that is not reached by railroads and other common carriers of traffic that can be reached speedily and readily by the motor truck. It has been estimated that there are hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of farm products that are not brought to the cities, because of the fact that they are on various farms along the road in such small quantities that it is hardly worth the while of the farmer to quit his work upon the farm and lose a day in carrying these products to the city, and yet, although small in amount at any one place, when taken together they constitute a vast amount of food. They can be sent on motor trucks at very small cost to the farmer—one-half of a cent per pound—and with practically no loss to the Government, and the people of the cities can have the benefit of a very much larger amount of food than they now have. Surely it must be conceded that at the present time there is in the cities and towns of our country a dearth of food, that food is very costly, and that this additional supply brought in and placed upon the market, in addition to that which is brought through the general channels of transportation, will so enlarge the supply of food products as to bring down the price to the consumers in the cities, and in the same way the products of the city may go to the farm. That is the general purpose of this provision, and I think that it very well and properly carries out the purpose.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. MOON. Certainly.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does the gentleman know about how far from the cities the Postmaster General contemplates sending these trucks?

Mr. MOON. I do not know how far from the cities, but they might go a hundred miles. There has been a very intelligent statement in detail of the purposes of this provision and the effect of it and the cost of it. I will not undertake to state from memory all that has been said upon the subject, but a little later on I will ask that there be read from the Clerk's desk the statement of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General on the subject, in which he goes into all the details as to the cost of the service, and the benefits that may be derived from it, and the ultimate value of the service without ultimate loss to the Government. The same statement was printed as an exhibit to my remarks made a few days since.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment. I have already referred to this bill, and I criticized it. I am not opposed to the principle of the Government undertaking the transportation of farm products and parcels, but I think it ought to be done so as not to encumber the other mail. The statements of the department officials published by me the other day show that the parcel post is impeding the first-class mail. The two ought to be separated, and, in my opinion, the Post Office Department ought to go further than this proposition, and establish a sort of express-package busi-

ness and keep it separate, so as not to interfere with the high-class mails.

This amendment is a most vicious proposition. The constitution provides that no money shall be taken out of the Treasury except pursuant to appropriation by Congress. Here is money collected by the department, which the department wants reappropriated, for use in a temporary experiment. It seems to me that is a vicious practice. They can carry on this experiment and determine whether it is a success without this authority.

Perhaps it will be a success. I do not know. I hope so. But if it is a success they do not need extraordinary authority. They can come to Congress at the next session and get all the money that is required. This is a very dangerous thing to do in the way that it is proposed. We have done it a few times in case of emergency, but certainly there is no emergency existing here that authorizes the Post Office Department to collect revenue and then use it over again for this experimental purpose. This is not a regular postal activity. It is considered simply an experiment in the transportation of articles growing on the farms, bringing them to the city, and bringing to the farmer the things that he gets from the city. It will never be a success unless you do it under different conditions than it is proposed to be done here. It should not be done under fixed rates of postage. If you want to make it a success, they ought to do as an express company does and establish a reasonable rate to meet the rates of competitors. Now, everybody knows that the express companies are using the post office for the purpose of transporting unprofitable business, and where the haul is profitable they take it themselves. With fixed rates of postage that can not be avoided. If you are going to make this movement from the farm to the consumer in the cities and back again to the farm a success, you ought to establish a regular package-freight business. If you then transfer the parcel post to a separate bureau, the two will work together, and you will not hamper the first-class mail.

There is room for an extension of Government authority, but it should be broad and well throughout. We should not only utilize motor trucks and highways, but trolley lines, railroads, and water routes, and establish terminals to transact the business as a separate activity from the regular mail.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am opposed to this amendment. The Post Office Department in recent years endeavored to establish a so-called parcel post "from the farm to the table" movement. I wanted to inquire of the gentleman who has just taken his seat, what has been the success of that project?

Mr. STEENERSON. Does the gentleman inquire of me?

Mr. HELM. If the gentleman knows, I should like to have the information right quick.

Mr. STEENERSON. All I know is that I have read laudatory descriptions of it in periodicals, which have advertised it without expense to the department.

Mr. HELM. I know that in a general way, in the large cities like Cincinnati, Washington, Baltimore, Louisville, and places of that kind, a systematic effort was undertaken through the parcel post to bring the farm in touch with the table, but I do not think it amounted to much, and this is a worse proposition than that.

But that is a little side issue. In the present condition of our country, when we are in the throes of the most gigantic war, to be piddling and delving into every little experiment of this kind and of every nature is absolutely preposterous, to my way of thinking. My mind may be an abnormal one—

Mr. MOON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HELM. No; I can not yield. We are going to divert \$300,000 into this kind of a scheme, we are going to install self-operating telephones, and flying-machine postal service, and every new-fangled scheme and project that can be hatched up right here in war times, when the money ought to be used for war purposes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And for Garabeds.

Mr. HELM. Yes; and for "Garabeds," as if there was no bottom to the Treasury of the United States. I know how futile it is for men to get up here and make this kind of a talk. I might just as well speak against a cliff, but, gentlemen, here is the last edition of a Washington paper, and one of the headlines says, "Defeat, but not disaster." The conditions in France ought to be at this time a sort of "stop, look, and listen" signal, which should be right above the Speaker's desk, so that every Member could see it and cause you to pause. Here you are rushing headlong as if you were on a joy ride, with the bars down. You take another plunge into the Treasury. France is being overrun to-day. It is a vital question as to whether this drive can be stopped or not. Can you not see that our re-

sponsibility is growing and expanding at an accelerating ratio every second? More man power is going to be demanded of us. This means more money; it means more expenditures of every kind; yet here we are like a lot of schoolboys picking up every newfangled proposition that is handed to us, and we vote for it like a lot of young birds with their mouths open, while the mother bird perches on a limb with a worm in her bill.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HELM. Yes; if the gentleman wants a worm, I will give him one.

Mr. LANGLEY. I think the gentleman is fully equipped for scattering that sort of product [laughter], but that is not my purpose in interrupting the gentleman. My purpose is to ask him if the object of this amendment is not to facilitate the transportation of farm products?

Mr. HELM. Foreign or farm products?

Mr. LANGLEY. Farm products, whether for foreign or domestic purposes. Our soldiers, as well as the people of the cities, have to be supplied with food. If that is the purpose of this proposition—to facilitate the transportation of farm products—how can it be so inadvisable as the gentleman states?

Mr. HELM. Is there a road in the gentleman's district where one of these trucks could run? [Laughter.] Before you could use one of these trucks in your district you would have to build a road.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman permit me to answer that? Yes; they could run in mine and in his, too. My district adjoins his, and I know personally that there are more mud-holes in his district than there are in mine. [Laughter.]

Mr. HELM. My district does not adjoin the gentleman's district by 50 miles. Is my time exhausted, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has half a minute more.

Mr. HELM. Gentlemen, if you have a serious thought about this war, if you are on the fighting side of this war, instead of on the money-making side, then I submit to you that you ought to stop, look, and listen. The sooner the American people get on the fighting side of this war issue instead of on the money-grabbing side of it and the money-making side of it the better.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELM. It is absolutely true that the rural carriers and the city delivery men are having a harder time in making buckle and tongue meet than ever before, but every man, woman, and child in the United States of America is having precisely the same difficulty. What is true of the rural carrier and the city carrier and the postal clerk is true of every human being in the United States. They have precisely the same difficulties to meet as the rural carrier and the city clerk and the postmaster, and this is a time when everyone has to share his part of the load, when every man, woman, and child in the United States has got to feel the pinch of this war. The office-holding class in the United States is not the only class to be looked after and to be safeguarded and surrounded with comforts and luxuries to make life easier and happier to them. The man who is entitled to some consideration at our hands is the man who has to go down into his jeans and dig up a part of the tax to pay the war expense and also the salaries of the office-holding classes, and you gentlemen ought to let that sink into you. The country is at war. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, if there is any merit in any proposition, it is in this, because this provision seeks to reduce the cost of living; it does not seek to make any money for anybody. It seeks to put the consumer in touch with the producer through the postal department, and we are proposing here to appropriate \$300,000, to be placed at the disposal of the Postmaster General, to make an experiment as to whether or not it is feasible and practical to remove the food supply from its place of origin to its place of consumption without having to go through the middleman. This might properly be termed a war measure, for in its execution it is proposed to relieve the burden of the ordinary man by reducing the cost of living. While we are making the experiment we ought to take advantage of all that we receive from the sale of supplies and use that to extend the service to a larger number of people. The people who live in the great cities of the country should have the advantage of a service such as this section proposes, if the Post Office Department can prove the practicability of such a service; and I maintain that, if we are to give the Postmaster General the power to experiment at all, we ought to give him that power to its fullest extent. He can not exercise the power

to its fullest extent unless he be given the right to use the receipts from the sale of the farm products in the form of a revolving fund.

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. STEENERSON. Is there anything in this provision to authorize the Government to sell farm produce?

Mr. MADDEN. Well, we bring it in and we make a charge for the service, which amounts to the same thing; and all that we receive from the charge we make, over and above the cost of the service, should be used for the extension of the service.

Mr. MOON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. MOON. If the gentleman will yield right there, because perhaps the House will not want all of this report read, I want to remind him that the Post Office Department in making this estimate upon a route of a hundred miles, 50 miles each way, in calculating the expense of the whole year on 2,000 pounds at the parcel-post rate, \$10 for 313 days a year, estimates it would yield \$3,130; but the operating of vehicles to convey half a ton each way is \$1,740.15 and the expense account is \$1,200 a year of the carrier, so at the lowest estimate the profit will be \$189.85.

Mr. MADDEN. So that if we have a profit from all of these routes and we use the funds derived from that profit to extend the service so that it can be granted to more people, if that be done, and if there is any surplus, and if at the end of the year it can be shown that the service is a valuable service; that it is performing the function that it was intended to perform; that it has put the consumer and the producer in touch with each other; that it has reduced the cost of living; that it has proved to be a service in which the Government should engage—

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Then we ought to continue the service. In just a moment—and if at the end of the period of experimentation—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. I ask that the gentleman have one minute additional, as I desire to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may speak one minute. Is there objection?

Mr. HAMLIN. Make it three minutes. I want to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks that the gentleman from Illinois be permitted to speak for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield to me? I got him the extension of time.

Mr. MADDEN. Let me complete the sentence. If at the end of the period of experimentation the department is not able to show that it is entitled to the expenditure of an additional sum, then the routes can be discontinued. I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. But does the gentleman consider who would pay this profit? Somebody must pay it if the Government makes it.

Mr. MADDEN. I presume the consumer would pay the difference between the Government operation and the sum received for the operation.

Mr. BRITTEN. He pays it now.

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. And how is that going to reduce the cost of living if he has got to pay this great profit to the Government to get his produce into town?

Mr. MADDEN. Quite a different proposition from that which now obtains. The farmer to-day produces and then he employs agencies to remove his product to the consumer. Does he move that production to the consumer directly? Not at all. He moves it to the place where some middleman is employed and the middleman then has got to pay a storage charge, clerical force; he has to charge a profit for his own service, and sometimes it is advanced 100 per cent on the original cost.

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. Just one more question.

Mr. MADDEN. Just a moment. Whereas the Government of the United States proposes only to charge the difference between the cost of the operation of his vehicle and price he charges for the use of the vehicle, which is a very nominal difference.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield to me? I think my question will answer the interrogatory also of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING]. Does the gentleman know a very late Member of this House, a very active and honored Mem-

ber of this House, made a statement before a committee of this House of which I am a member right upon this point? He went out to Maryland about 25 miles and bought, I think, \$5 worth of produce—eggs, butter, and so forth—and let it come into the city in the ordinary way and go through the middle man—following it, however, to the consumer—and that \$5 worth of produce actually cost the consumer \$11 and something.

Mr. MADDEN. I can understand that very well.

Mr. HAMLIN. Whereas, to come by parcel post it would only cost about 50 cents.

Mr. MADDEN. It is to do away with that that we propose this experimentation, and if we can prove that we have saved 10 per cent over and above the present cost, we then have the right to claim that we have done a service worth while.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. WALSH. How much does the gentleman expect we are going to do away with on a \$300,000 scale?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, we do not expect to be able to serve all the American people, but we do expect possibly to prove from the experiment that we are able to reduce the cost or that we are not able to reduce it. But the main question is, Is it worth while to spend \$300,000 if by the expenditure of that money we may be able to do some good?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] is recognized.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I shall consume the five minutes of time. I can not believe that the three days of debate on this bill has been sincere. It strikes me as a very inopportune time for the Congress of the United States to devote three days of debate to increase of salaries when the world is burning up at this moment. Nero fiddled while Rome was on fire, and it strikes me that that is exactly what this Congress is doing now. With war bills of great and tremendous importance upon the calendar awaiting passage, with a bill on the calendar now, passed out of the Committee on Agriculture, proposing to furnish the farmers \$9,000,000 with which to buy seed this spring, every pressure being brought to bear upon the farmers to increase their products this summer, and yet those bills are not called up for consideration. And I have about made up my mind, without criticizing any particular one, that behind this filibuster here there must be an attempt to hold that bill appropriating \$9,000,000 for seed back from consideration. I am not able to understand it from any other conceivable viewpoint.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. COX. I can not yield now.

Now is the time to sow wheat in the Northwest. Two weeks from now it will be entirely too late to buy seed wheat. If that bill was put through here, with \$9,000,000 made available to the Department of Agriculture, there is no doubt the wheat products would be multiplied by hundreds of thousands of acres in that northwest country. The farmers in my State, all over that great corn belt last year, got badly hit as the result of the frost. They are seeking to-day to find where they can buy reliable seed corn in order to plant corn this summer. And yet this bill, that every Member of this House that knows anything about it knows will never become a law in its present shape, will be headed off somewhere before it is time for it to become a law; but three days must be consumed on the floor of this House in order to increase the salaries of certain postal employees.

Now, I quite agree with the gentleman from Chicago that this present provision, in my opinion, is the best provision in the entire bill. Experimental though it is, we must remember that 20 or 22 years ago the whole question of rural-route mail was an experimental matter, which has developed to-day to a certainty. It took 30 years to force through Congress a parcel-post bill. Until six years ago we could send by parcel post cheaper from here to Tokio, Japan, than we could here from one street corner to another. But special interests held it back, all the time claiming that parcel post could not be operated satisfactorily in this country; and it never was forced through Congress until powerful and potential organizations, to wit, of the farmers and the laboring men got behind it and compelled Congress to pass it. The question of food supply to-day is very largely one of transportation. It is bringing the city fellow and the country fellow into close touch. This is an experiment pure and simple. It is the best provision in the entire bill. To-day there is an experimental line like this running from Indianapolis, Ind., to Louisville, Ky.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LANGLEY and Mr. PLATT rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] is recognized.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, experiment with these motor mail routes has already gone far enough in a tentative way to show that in many sections they are going to be a success, and are almost certain to be a success where the roads are good enough to give them a fair chance. It seems to me that this is no extravagant appropriation, nor is it extravagant to allow the use of the receipts in establishing new routes. These motor mail routes are established so that they cross the railroads generally. That is the idea of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, who is very enthusiastic in advocating them, and it is a good idea. If possible, he establishes them so that they cross the railroads instead of paralleling them, and they actually develop new business. They have an effect on the territory served like a trolley road running out into a suburban district. Such a trolley will develop a new residential district. The land out in the country is worth nothing for residence purposes until you make some way for the people to get into town from it. And in the same way you can make it advantageous for farmers to cultivate land which they are not cultivating now, when you give them an easy way to send their products into market. These motor trucks pick up parcels, eggs, chickens, and so forth, properly crated or packed along the route. A great deal of it will doubtless be picked up at the smaller post offices, but a great deal of it also will be picked up at crossroads and at farmhouses and when it reaches the cities it will be delivered directly to the consignees, most of it, without being handled at the post offices. It seems to me this is a project that deserves every encouragement at this time. Doubtless some extravagant statements have been made as to what these motor mail routes will accomplish in the way of winning the war, but that they will cause land to be cultivated that is not now cultivated I have not any doubt. They will bring a certain amount of farm produce that now goes by roundabout ways or not at all directly into the towns and will reestablish in some cases old trade lines which have been abandoned since the building of railroads. They will be a good thing for the farmers and a good thing for the cities.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Does not the gentleman believe that if you can by these motor trucks transport perishable foodstuffs to the cities you will thus enable us to ship more nonperishable foodstuffs for war purposes?

Mr. PLATT. I think there is some truth in that.

Mr. FARR. It would be a relief to the railroads.

Mr. PLATT. Not only that, but in a good many cases it will bring to the smaller post offices much better connections for first-class mail. There are a great many places where the railroads run on north and south lines into the great cities, or on east and west lines. Mail from towns only a few miles apart now has to go into the cities on one line and out on another. Motor mail routes will in many cases connect such towns directly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, there was an amendment offered and is pending. I do not want to close debate on the section now. I think it would be a very good thing to devote time on the amendment that is offered. I move that debate close in 10 minutes.

Mr. STEENERSON. I was informed that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] wanted to discuss that amendment for a few minutes.

Mr. MOON. Discuss what?

Mr. STEENERSON. Wanted to discuss this amendment about the revolving fund.

Mr. MOON. I would not have any objection if he desires to discuss it. I want to close debate on that amendment as soon as we can.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. LANGLEY. I want five minutes.

Mr. STERLING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the committee, and I would like five minutes.

Mr. MOON. Will it be satisfactory to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. STERLING] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] to take five minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. What was the suggestion of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MOON. I will ask that all debate close on this particular amendment in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on this particular pending amendment close in 20 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MOON. I do not mean by that that the debate shall close on the motor-truck section, but that the debate shall close on the amendment offered to the amendment. The discussion will be extended on the motor-truck section.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I reserve the right to object. What is that amendment?

Mr. MOON. To the effect that the money is to be used as a revolving fund.

Mr. LEVER. Has the gentleman in mind how much time he will take on this section?

Mr. MOON. I can not possibly tell how long these gentlemen want to talk. I do not want to close them off too soon, but it seems to me this debate should close in half an hour.

Mr. LEVER. I desire to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that there is a rather important bill on the calendar from the Committee on Agriculture, which, if passed at all, ought to be passed very early. I understand that the Committee on Rules is ready to report a rule for its immediate consideration. The rule has been ordered reported out of the committee for some time.

While this matter is an exceedingly important matter, I still rather agree with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] that we have spent three whole days talking about whether a fourth-class postmaster ought to get \$80 or get \$85 a year. It seems to me that there ought to be some close to this, in order that other legislation, more important legislation, may be taken up. [Applause.]

Mr. POU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. POU. The gentleman from Tennessee having yielded, I want to say to the House and to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture that a rule providing for the consideration of the matter to which the gentleman from South Carolina referred is ready to be presented immediately after this bill is disposed of.

Mr. LEVER. I knew that, and therefore I made the statement to the House.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman should not be in too great a hurry about that. I am going to amend my motion, or withdraw the motion I made, and ask that all debate on this section and the pending amendments and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes.

Mr. LANGLEY. I reserve the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGLEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I have been seeking recognition for some time.

Mr. MOON. I did not ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman. I know I can not get that. I make the motion. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STERLING of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANGLEY, Mr. TREADWAY, Mr. NORTON, and Mr. DEMPSEY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. STERLING] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. STERLING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the committee, in the brief period of time allotted to me I shall urge the adoption by the committee of the amendment proposed by Judge Moon, of Tennessee, to that section of the bill which authorizes experiments in motor-truck delivery and also undertake to show to the committee the wisdom of adopting, when so amended, the section which is in itself being considered by the Committee of the Whole House as an amendment to the pending bill by virtue of the resolution reported by the Committee on Rules and approved.

What is the substance of the section Judge Moon proposes to amend and what is the nature of that amendment? The section provides that the Postmaster General shall expend a sum, not exceeding \$300,000, to conduct experiments in the operation of motor-vehicle truck routes, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, and between such points or cities of the Nation as he may select.

The Moon amendment provides, in substance, that whatever profits are derived from the experiment, namely the operation of motor-truck routes, may be used by the Postmaster General for the further extension and advancement of the motor-truck delivery system.

Who is there to contend, if this experiment shows a substantial profit, that the plan should not be extended and enlarged? And who is there to contend, if the experiment proves beneficial and helpful to the Nation and to the people, in the present emergency, that the motor-truck delivery system should not be encouraged and supported?

The purpose of the proposed experiment is to determine if such plan will promote a conservation of food products, facilitate a collection and delivery thereof from the producer to the

consumer, and also provide a means of delivery to the producer of those articles necessary and essential to food production.

The cry of our Nation in the present world crisis is that men, ships, and guns will win the war. This same slogan may be said to be the belief of every nation on earth fighting for the maintenance of free government and against the advancement of the military propaganda of the Hun.

Let me say to the committee that in the assembling of the man power of the world for this contest, in the preparation for the construction of ships and the manufacture of guns, there are two primary essentials first to be considered, and those are food and fuel. The men assembled and selected for military purposes are dependent upon the production of sufficient foodstuffs to sustain and support them, and they are equally dependent on the fuel of the Nation to operate and run the industries and manufacturing establishments organized to turn out the ships, the guns, and all war equipment. The industries of the country will become useless unless there is produced and transported to the seats of industry the proper quantities of coal and coke.

The civilian population of the Nation, a great portion of which is found in the centers of population—the large cities and industrial communities—will be found in many instances far from the fields of agricultural development and the production of foodstuffs.

Food and fuel will win the war. It must not only be produced, but arrangements must be made to transport the foodstuffs and the fuel to the places where it is most needed. This duty will fall to the American people. It is imperative. It should and must be encouraged by the National Government. This is no time to quibble about the expense; it is necessary and must be done.

This Government nor its citizenship, the taxpayers, will ever be able to estimate the loss in men and money occasioned by the delays brought about by the unprepared conditions, in power and equipment, of the railroad systems of the country when the present war situation was forced upon us.

The man power of the Nation has already been diverted from the usual avocations of life into two fields, both closely identified with the military preparation. First, 2,000,000 and more of the best man power of the country are now trained for military service in the field of battle. Second, more of the productive man power has been encouraged to engage in that class of labor directly allied with the preparation of the war program; that is, by working in the mines, the munition factories, the shipyards, and all other industries engaged in the construction and manufacture of war equipment.

In my judgment, there will soon necessarily be a diversion of a large portion of the civilian population of the country to special fields of industry. It may be necessary to take the unemployed from the centers of population to the agricultural fields of production in order that we may produce the necessary foodstuffs to support not only the men in the military service, but also to feed the very large number of our people located in the big cities of the country and in the industrial sections of the Nation, where the production of farm and agricultural products has been made almost prohibitive by the high price of wage paid to the laboring man, whose service has been regarded as essential in the preparation of war equipment.

Without these necessary foodstuffs the soldier in the field will be unable to perform his service; without this necessary food in the large cities, centers of population, and industrial communities, there will become unrest, dissatisfaction, and serious conditions.

Therefore we must not only arrange to produce the fuel and the foodstuffs in abundant quantities, but we must also arrange, by every possible method of transportation, to carry that fuel and that foodstuff from the fields of production to the very places where it is needed to satisfy the requirements and the demands of the people.

The power and equipment of the railroad companies were found to be deficient. There may be, and there no doubt is, a better systematized arrangement for the use of the power and the equipment of the railway systems of the Nation under its present management, but who will contend that there has been sufficient opportunity to increase the power and the equipment so as to handle properly the fuel, the foodstuffs, and the war equipment so necessary in this emergency.

Whatever railroad power and equipment can be saved from the transportation of foodstuffs to the centers of population and industrial communities by adopting any other means or method of transportation will make available the use of that railroad power and equipment for the transportation of fuel—coal and coke—to the seats of industry, to the centers of population, for industrial and domestic purposes. In other words,

the States of West Virginia, Illinois, and Pennsylvania produce more than 60 per cent of the coal produced annually in the United States, and large sections of these States formerly engaged in the production of agricultural products are now almost entirely engaged in the production of coal and coke, and many thousands of people living in these industrial communities are dependent for their foodstuffs on other sections of the country.

Railroad power and equipment, deficient though it may be, must without other preparation, be used to carry food to these people to feed and sustain them while they labor to produce the fuel so much needed by the Nation. If this railroad power or equipment can be saved, or any portion of it, why not proceed to the necessity?

I assume to make the statement, that if there could be furnished to the sections of the country where is found the valuable deposits of coal, sufficient railroad power and equipment to transport the greatest possible production capable of the man power now engaged in that industry, that much of the necessity for the regulation of coal and coke prices would be removed, and the domestic and industrial needs of the country properly supplied.

The coal and coke operators, in at least a portion of the Pennsylvania district which I have the honor to represent in this Congress—and it is one of the leading coal and coke producing districts of the Nation—are already making preparation to meet the food situation as best they can. Many of the operators of Fayette County, Pa., have purchased thousands of dollars' worth of tractors, seed, and food materials for garden purposes. They have arranged to give the laboring man sections of land to plant and cultivate, furnishing to him the seed and material, with the understanding that he has the benefit of the crops and foodstuffs raised therefrom, and this is all done for the purpose of meeting any possible scarcity of food, and handling any possible condition of disquiet and discontent. These men will do their best, and while the mines and men are idle on account of transportation facilities they will labor in the gardens being now provided.

These extend into and through at least four of the most important counties in southwestern Pennsylvania for the production of coal and coke two highways of recognized national reputation. The Lincoln Highway would open up to the coal fields of southwestern Pennsylvania the great agricultural county of Lancaster, in Pennsylvania, and, through the great agricultural Cumberland Valley, the old National Road extends. These particular agricultural sections, and all of the agricultural lands between these sections and the coal region, would furnish a means of providing foodstuffs to the industrial regions of western Pennsylvania and the large cities thereof if properly organized, and thereby save the railroad power hereinbefore referred to. Like lines of communication could be established elsewhere in the Nation.

There are 156,000 miles of improved hard-surfaced highways in the United States. Important mail matter and valuable food products could be collected and delivered by means of motor vehicles along these highways, so that a distance of at least 80 miles may be covered in a period of 12 hours. I believe that the earning power of the system will exceed the cost. But, after all, the present emergency requires additional methods of transportation for these essential articles. The Post Office Department, gentlemen of the committee, has already in a small way undertaken this character of service. I read to you, and will have placed in the Record, a statement of postage, weight, and cost covering a period of six days in the present month on Government-owned motor-truck routes.

On the route established between Baltimore and Oxford the postage on first and fourth class matter amounted to \$62.37; the total weight of pounds carried, 749½; and the cost of maintenance, \$63.

And now I call your attention to the postage, weight, and cost of six other routes. The first item in each instance will be the postage received by the Government for the carriage of first and fourth class mail matter, the second item the weight, and the third item the cost:

Route.	Postage.	Weight.	Cost.
Baltimore-Mount Airy.....	\$475.73	7,940	\$54.33
Hagerstown-Mount Airy.....	198.35	2,124	74.52
Baltimore-Gettysburg.....	355.67	4,328	59.04
Lancaster-Gettysburg.....	203.82	1,866	67.80
Baltimore-Solomons.....	1,120.55	12,427½	127.50
Philadelphia-Oxford.....	645.66	17,718	145.08

And further, gentlemen of the committee, on Wednesday, March 20, this year, a motor truck left Lancaster, Pa., for New York City, a distance of 180 miles or thereabout. It carried

approximately 3,000 pounds of parcel-post matter, and reached its place of destination in a running time of 12 hours. The postage derived from this trip amounted to \$31.60, and the direct expense thereof approximately \$10—\$4 for a driver, \$6 for gas.

The parcel-post matter embraced 4,000 1-day-old chicks, Easter season; 200 pounds of honey; 500 pounds of smoked sausage; 500 pounds of butter; and 18,000 eggs. When the consignment was turned over to the consignee, 9 eggs were found to be broken in transit and 2 chicks had died.

On the same day the same man in Lancaster shipped 28,800 eggs to the same consignee by express, and approximately 10,000 eggs of that consignment were destroyed by rough handling in course of transit.

It seems to me that the character of legislation embraced within the subject now under discussion must not only be considered in the nature of an experiment, but rather in the nature of a necessity. I hope that the amendment offered by Judge Moon after this section will be adopted, and that the section itself will then be adopted by the committee as one of the outstanding and important features of the legislative enactment now before the House.

I desire, briefly, to refer to other sections of the bill, providing for the increase of pay to rural carriers and postal employees. There has been pronounced criticism by a few Members of the House against the character of this legislation. Certain prominent Members, distinguished for their ability and legislative experience, have referred to this measure as an unwarranted raid on the Treasury of the United States, and others have classed it as pork-barrel legislation. Long before I ever expected to have the honor of a seat in the Congress of the United States I very frequently read of Treasury raids by the Congress and of "pork-barrel legislation." In times past allegations have been repeatedly made, regardless of what political party was in power. I do not believe this legislation to be in the nature of pork-barrel legislation, and if it is, no more equitable distribution has ever been made by a legislative body. This proposed increase of wage directly benefits more than 250,000 American citizens. It helps to reestablish and make more efficient the mail service of the country, a service that was inaugurated and has constantly been improved, for the purpose of bringing into closer relationship the commercial life, the business interests, and the people operating and living in one community or State with those in another community or State.

A few years ago the people living in rural communities were afforded an opportunity to carry on correspondence relative to their commercial and business interests with other sections of their county, State, and Nation by going to fourth-class post-offices which had been established by the Government, and to which offices the mail was carried by contractual agreement. Then the Government, through the Post Office Department, seeing the necessity of making a still closer relationship between the people and the business interests, provided a more efficient service by establishing the rural route, until the rural carriers of the country reached annually in this Nation 28,000,000 of its population.

This closer relationship of people, business, and the commercial life of the Nation was further benefited by the establishment of the parcel-post system along these many, many rural routes, and when that great benefit was placed within the reach of the people of this Nation they quickly took advantage of it and established their lines of communication for business and commercial purposes throughout each of the communities, and reaching from community to State and from one State to another. To-day many of these important rural routes have become disabled and inefficient, in fact abandoned entirely, because the carrier is unable to support himself and his family, feed and care for his horses and keep up his equipment and provide for a replacement of the equipment necessary to carry on his business on the salary he now receives. The fact is he has left the rural-carrier route and sought better wages in other fields of industry, and was forced to do it to meet the increased cost of the necessities of life for the support of himself and his family. It has prevented the circulation of the important loyal newspapers of the country to a vast portion of the Nation's loyal citizenship. This citizenship must be kept in close touch, it must be forewarned against the enemy propaganda, and 28,000,000 of the country's population must not be placed beyond the reach of this educational influence. The fourth-class post office can not in this emergency be reestablished where the rural route has taken its place.

In the district which I represent the rural-carrier service is almost hopelessly disorganized. Farmers and laboring men have formed committees and selected one man out of a com-

munity to furnish the equipment and deliver the mail for a period covering a week at a time, and then another would substitute and take his place, to the end that all of the patrons of that route would be served. I have tried to have young men, intelligent, bright boys, placed at this work, but have been confronted with a departmental ruling from the Civil Service Commission that no boy under 17 years of age may be a substitute carrier and no boy under 18 years of age may be a permanent rural carrier. This, to me, is a ruling that at least for the present should be suspended. I am unable to see why an American boy, physically and mentally fit to perform the service of keeping intact the lines of communication established by the rural-carrier system, is not competent for that position, when it was the argument, I am told, by the Army Staff, that such character of American manhood was physically and mentally fit to enter the military service of the Nation to fight the trained Prussian military advancement.

The Government can not afford to have this great mail system fail to properly function in this emergency. If there is no other way to maintain these lines of communication in their efficiency, some substantial increase of payment must be made. The rural carriers and the postal employees are entitled to an increase on their own account, and the efficiency of the mail system of the country requires that the line of communication be always open and always working.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to supplement the statement that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. STERLING] has just made by giving the aggregate of the expenses and postal receipts of the six routes to which he refers. The total weight carried over those six experimental routes was 15,236 pounds. The actual cost of operation, maintenance, overhead charges, depreciation of the trucks, and so forth, was \$386.22. The total postage received was \$2,417.49, a profit of seven times the actual cost. These figures represent six days' operation during the present month. It seems to me that is a very excellent governmental experiment. As a rule, experiments are mighty expensive. Here is an experiment that is making money for the Government, and it is right and fair that that experimental profit should be used for the continuation of the experiment and the extension of the effort to establish these motor-truck routes through farming districts. I disagree absolutely with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] who said that the debate on this bill had not been sincere, that we were trying to choke off some other legislation. Has there been anything more sincere than the effort that this House has made during the past three days to better the condition of the Postal Service men in this country? I think it has been time well spent and money well invested. [Applause.]

This proposition comes right home to another class of our people. My district is partially a farming community in western Massachusetts, adjoining a section of Connecticut and near to a section of New York, portions as inaccessible as any sections in those respective States. The farms are being depopulated, farming is dying out, and all for lack of accessibility to the markets. This sort of service will provide for farming communities means of reaching market centers. The establishment of a motor route through the section to which I refer, which will put into communication with the market the sort of country where we are appealing to the people to better the farming conditions, to produce more and to bring it to the market for consumption both here and abroad, is one of the most useful propositions in which the Government can engage. I have seen nothing in the way of service to the people of the country that promises more than this move to establish motor routes. The deserted farm in our country has been a very serious question. Our State legislature has for a long time had that problem before it. Our State board of agriculture has been greatly exercised over it. It is not because the farming community is a poor one. It is the richest possible kind of a farming section, but the very fact of the inaccessibility of the market is what prevents its production being brought up to its highest standard. So give the farmer this chance, experiment in just such a section of the country as that, and it will redound both to the profit of the country and to the amount of production of the farm. I am sincerely interested in the passage both of the amendment suggested and the amendment to it that the chairman of the committee has proposed. It is proper that the profit shown in this experiment of 7 to 1 over the cost should be used for a continuation of the experiment. [Applause.]

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNYDER. I should like to say to the gentleman that I live in a farming community, and so far as I have been able to learn no farmer has suggested this proposition to me. I doubt the feasibility of it myself very much.

Mr. TREADWAY. I will say that no farmer in my section has suggested it. It would perhaps be the last thing that the farmer might think of proposing, but we want to offer to bring it to him rather than wait for him to ask to have it brought to him.

The farmers are much exercised over the men who have been called to the service and the great difficulty of securing necessary farm help to take their places. By adoption of motor routes, instead of being obliged to take a considerable portion of time to carry produce to market, it can be loaded onto motor trucks and delivered to the centers in much less time than over the usual means of communication and in much better condition.

Take, for illustration, a shipment of a case of eggs. If loaded on a truck no handling is required until delivery in the market. If sent by any other way, from inaccessible sections, the number of times the case would be handled is problematical. Butter, berries, milk, and every perishable commodity of the farm can be handled better and quicker in this manner than under existing conditions. It opens a very wide field of improvement in farming methods, and I bespeak for the rural communities I represent the favorable consideration of the House for the pending measure. Further than this, it is not like many forms of legislation, entailing large expense. The experiments have been carried sufficiently far to prove the service will be profitable as well as very beneficial.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, this is a war measure if ever there was one introduced in any legislative body in the world. It is not merely a matter of saving in the cost of distribution which this legislation seeks to attain. We know that if we win this war we must conserve food, man power, and motive power. This bill looks to a better utilization of the vegetable-producing energy of this country. As stated by my colleague from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], in proportion as we can increase the use of vegetables in this country we will remove the burden from the grain and meat crops of this country and make possible a greater exportation of those products. There is nothing that can utilize the odds and ends of time and labor as vegetable production can utilize them. Let us see what is the situation. These food commodities are produced in the country. Somebody must get them to market. The practical, common-sense proposition that presents itself to a Congress engaged in guiding a country in the conduct of a great war is, Can we conserve man power by having one man drive a truck over 50 miles and gather up the products of the farms along those 50 miles instead of having each farmer along that 50-mile route hitch up his own conveyance, take his own time, and undertake to get his commodity to the market? I submit that it is common sense to send somebody around with a vehicle that can gather up from these farms the vegetables and other small parcels of food products which they want to send to market, and let the farmer stay at home, continue the day's work, and raise more food to help win the war. That is practical common sense.

Another thing. If we properly utilize this service we will establish distribution routes in the cities. When these trucks enter the city, instead of going to the post office and having to clear through the post office the products brought in, they will take these commodities over the delivery routes, and the people in the cities can get on their tables that evening the commodities that were gathered fresh from the farms in the morning. And in proportion as you can get these wholesome, fresh vegetables to the table of the city man at a price freed from a multiplicity of profits and which puts no limit upon the amount that he can afford to buy, you will indirectly increase the amount of exportable grain and meat.

Besides, gentlemen, we have reached a point in this country where those of us who live in the cities must recognize the fact that in the price we pay for what we eat we must stand the overhead charges upon distribution. We not only must pay the overhead charges upon distribution, but those of us who buy vegetables and eat them must pay for the vegetables that rot in the field. You know, as a matter of common sense, that a farmer who has, say, one extra basket of beans above what is needed at home can not afford to hitch up his team and take those beans 8 or 10 miles to market, but if a man will come along driving a truck for the Government his wife can send those beans to somebody in the city. If those beans are not eaten by somebody in the city, they will rot in the field after they are produced—a food waste and an economic waste.

Then those of us who do eat beans must pay in the price we give for the beans we eat the value of those beans that rot in the field, which we never had a chance to buy. We must do that because agriculture must be put on a plane with every other calling. We have to pay the farmer as much net profit to stay on the farm as he can make if he goes to the factory.

That is the reason why you have been losing your population in New England. Agriculture has not been able to meet the bid of New England industry. Much of this back-to-the-farm-movement stuff is all rot. You might just as well go down here and haul the water out of the Potomac River up to Great Falls and empty it into the river there and expect it to stay as to put people on the farm, unless you make it just as profitable to farm as to engage in any other business in the world. Let us at least make an earnest intelligent test of this proposition, which seems to be practical and unquestionably is aimed in a right direction.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, a little while ago in a friendly colloquy between my distinguished colleague, Mr. HELM, and myself I stated that my district adjoins his, and he said in reply that the boundary of my district does not come within 50 miles of his. I regret to have to advertise to the House the inaccuracy of his geographical information, and I would not do so but for the fact that I would leave myself in an attitude warranting the presumption that I am lacking in the same line of knowledge if I did not call attention to the fact that the county of Jackson, which is in my district, borders on the county of Madison, which is in his district. It was originally cut off from his district to the eleventh district, and later from the eleventh to the tenth district. Incidentally I might remark in passing that the Republican majority of Jackson County has greatly increased since it was cut off from his district, which warrants the inference, I think, that the county has profited by the transfer.

Mr. HELM. How long has that been taken out of the eleventh district?

Mr. LANGLEY. About six years. It was transferred to the eleventh many years ago and put into the tenth by the act of 1912.

Mr. HELM. That is one of the perambulating counties of the eleventh district.

Mr. LANGLEY. A Democratic legislature is responsible for whatever perambulating there may have been. I did not have anything to do with that.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this is about the first time since I have been a Member of this body that I have at one and the same time agreed with both the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON]. When both of these distinguished statesmen, so radically different temperamentally and politically, come together on a proposition, it must be right. I shall support this amendment because I believe it is a step in the right direction, and I congratulate both of them upon the fact that they are showing a disposition to-day to be a little more generous toward the people in the rural districts than they exhibited yesterday. I regretted to see them throw their powerful influence against the effort we were making to aid the star-route carriers and the fourth-class postmasters, all of whom are greatly underpaid and sadly in need of congressional relief. The gentleman from Tennessee says that these motor trucks will probably go as far as a hundred miles from the city. That will help some, and it shows a tendency to depart from the custom which has prevailed too much heretofore of confining the large appropriations and the benefits of Federal aid generally to the large cities and their environs and neglecting the rural districts. There is another indication, which I am glad to see, that a little more consideration is being given to the people who live in the country.

During my many years of service here I have observed that, as a rule, the city chaps—excuse me, I mean city Members—do not seem to be able to see clearly beyond the corporate limits of their own municipality. I am glad to note that this mental astigmatism is gradually passing away, and the fact that the two distinguished gentlemen to whom I have referred both concur in this proposition to help the farmers a little bit is very gratifying to me as a country Member of Congress. Another healthy sign of the times that I have noticed lately is that we do not hear and read now, as we used to, so much facetious tommyrot about the sharpshooters of the mountains. We need them in this war. We do not hear and read so much as we used to about "Senator Sorghum" and "hayseed," about "Bitter Creek," "Podunk," and "Pumpkin Center." It is now becoming generally recognized that we need this class of our citizenship to produce the foodstuffs necessary to keep the city chaps from starving to death as well as to feed our soldiers. [Applause.]

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that when this proposition becomes a law that it will be so enforced by the Post Office Department as to carry out the purposes which Congress had in view in enacting it, and that it will be enforced in a more liberal spirit than has been the policy of that department with regard to the star-route carriers.

Some resentment has already been shown in this debate of criticism of the Post Office Department in this connection. I

have had a good deal of experience with that department, especially with regard to star routes, and I say to you that in my humble opinion Shylock of old, in the zenith of his unconscionable career, could not have been more merciless in his demand for his pound of flesh than has been the Post Office Department in insisting upon the literal enforcement of its contracts with regard to star routes, which are, in my opinion, the most one-sided contracts, that the Government was ever a party to.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. I can not yield now. It is no answer to that to say that they are made and enforced in accordance with the laws enacted by Congress, because I know of innumerable cases where the work has increased to such an extent that it is absolutely cruel to insist upon the performance of the contract without additional compensation, which the department has it in its power to grant, and without permitting the reletting of the contract, which the department also has it in its power to do. It is no answer to this argument to say that a contractor ought not to be paid any more than his bid, for the simple reason that conditions have changed since the contract was made. The cost of living has increased enormously; the cost of equipment has increased; the cost of feed and of labor has increased, so that in many instances it actually costs practically twice as much to carry the mail as it did when the contract was entered into. I realize, Mr. Chairman, that I am digressing somewhat from the rules governing the debate under the five-minute rule, but the pressure for time yesterday was so great that I could not get an opportunity to say some things that I wanted to say about these star-route carriers, who are having such a hard time just now under these prevailing high prices. I wish I had the time to tell you gentlemen about some cases that have come under my personal observation. Why, Mr. Chairman, I know of cases where it is costing carriers almost twice as much as they are getting from the Government under their contract. There have been almost enough mountain mules and horses and buckboards put out of commission to supply the Quartermaster Department in the patriotic effort of these men to carry out their contract with the Government. It is unfair and unjust for the Government to refuse to give relief under such circumstances. We have increased the compensation of rural carriers and nearly all other classes of employees in the Postal Service, and it is a crying shame that this class of the Government's employees, who need relief more than any other class, apparently can not get it. I voted for all of these other increases, and yet when we ask for some specific relief for these star-route carriers we are met with a sort of indefinite proposition which is clothed with elastic language that might be construed— [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, during the debate that we have had upon this bill to increase the salaries of postal employees I have listened to so much ill-timed and unfounded criticism of the Post Office Department that I am tired of it and feel compelled to say a word in reply. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY], who has just addressed the House, says that the policy of the Post Office Department in dealing with these star-route contractors is the policy of a shlylock. As a matter of fact, the Postmaster General has no right under the law to alter or modify these star-route and screen-wagon contracts, and the reason we have put this provision in the bill is at the suggestion of the Postmaster General, in order that he may have authority to investigate these cases and give relief in proper cases. There is no question but that there are some contractors now who are laboring under considerable difficulties, and the purpose is to allow the Post Office Department to correct these conditions.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. I am sorry that I can not yield.

Mr. WALSH. Then I make the point of order that the gentleman is now discussing the amendment before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas will proceed in order.

Mr. BLACK. I yield to the gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. WALSH. I dislike very much to make a point of order, but the gentleman is a member of this important committee and I would like very much to have whatever information he can give on the pending amendment. I do not think we are interested particularly in the amendments that have been adopted, but the gentleman is a very able member of the committee and I would like to get his opinion upon this.

Mr. BLACK. The gentleman from Texas is discussing the extraneous matters that have been brought in by the gentleman from Kentucky and some other gentlemen who have heretofore spoken in this debate.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; but this is another day.

Mr. BLACK. I believe that the gentleman from Massachusetts referred to the fact on yesterday that post-office inspectors did not give prior notice that they were coming to inspect a post office in order that the postmaster might get ready for the visit. And it occurred to me that would be a very novel matter to criticize the Postmaster General about.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman appreciates the fact that debate upon this amendment has been limited to a certain time, and I am sure the House would receive valuable information from the gentleman upon the pending amendment.

Mr. BLACK. I did not rise to discuss the pending amendment, and if I am to be held to that—

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BLACK. I thank the gentleman. Now, then, I just want to say a word further in reply to some of these criticisms. I think it is an amazing fact that the Postmaster General has been criticized on the floor of the House during the debate on this bill for conducting the Post Office Department upon a self-sustaining basis. I suppose according to that line of argument that if he had created a deficit he would have been entitled to fine praise. During the five years of his administration it is true that the great department under his able management has paid all of the expenses and has left some surplus. Is that to his discredit? Has the time come when an official of the Government is to be penalized for the use of business efficiency in the conduct of the public business? Indeed, I think not. I think he ought to have the approval and support of the country [applause], because notwithstanding all of the criticism that has been voiced upon the floor of this House by some gentlemen who have spoken and by some labor and postal organizations and that has found its way into some of the newspapers— notwithstanding that, I say without fear of successful contradiction that there has never been a time in the history of this country when the Post Office Department taken as a whole was more efficiently administered than it is to-day. I say this in reply to some of the unfair criticism which we have heard during this debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am going to refer to the fact that this House has taken some time for the consideration of this bill, as did my distinguished friend from Indiana [Mr. Cox], for whose zeal, earnestness, and ability I have the very highest respect; but I want to refer to the time taken in order to compliment the House that while we have been doing a just and good thing, we have done it deliberately, thoughtfully, carefully. We have not done it hastily. We have not done it in a way to be criticized at all. Now, gentlemen, I want to come to the question here of the Post Office Department operating motor trucks through the country to market agricultural products and bring back goods from the cities. I live in the county of Niagara, one of the greatest producing counties in the United States. We raise in profusion practically everything that can grow in the temperate zone. We raise fruits of all kinds, we raise vegetables, we raise every kind of grain, and we have had practical experience with this question of marketing our products by motor truck. So I speak not from theory, I speak not of what can be done, but I speak of that which actually has been done in the county of Niagara. We have farmers in my county who raise 40,000 baskets of peaches and 7,000 or 8,000 bushels of apples. Last year, when those peaches were hanging ripe upon the trees—

Mr. SNYDER. If the gentleman will permit, I desire to say the gentleman is somewhat of a farmer himself, and I want to say I visited him last summer, and on one of his farms he had 7,000 baskets of peaches. [Applause.]

Mr. DEMPSEY. When we had last fall our peaches hanging ready for harvest upon the trees, when the cities and villages throughout this Union needed them, when they were of incalculable value, the transportation facilities of all the railroads—and we have three trunk lines in the State of New York, and besides that we have the Erie, the Lackawanna, and the Lehigh running out of Buffalo—those great systems all broke down completely, and we had to use the motor truck and the cold-storage warehouses. So I say to you, gentlemen, that, although we did it haphazard—because it was haphazard as we organized it in our need—yet it proved a great relief. What we did haphazardly will prove of great and incalculable value when done as you propose to do it here—systematically, day by day, upon a schedule. It will do more than simply relieve congestion. It will, so far as the railroads are concerned, relieve them of transportation to the near-by centers and supply them by the motor-truck lines. And you will supply them in this way. You will supply them better than the railroad will supply them in two or three ways. First, you will supply them in the knowledge from day to day of what their needs will be. You

will supply them more certainly, because the motor trucks will reach the market when the car may be sidetracked somewhere and stay until the fruit is decayed. Again, when it reaches the market it will be delivered exactly where it is needed, and the car has to be sent to certain people, and it may not reach there for two or three days. Then, it will answer another thing. You will find upon every farm each day that there are articles of food which go to waste, and yet the farmer can not afford to transport them, even though they be of great value in the city. If the farmer has vegetables or fruit ripe and ready for market but too small in quantity to pay him to market them, he will gather them and deliver them to the passing motor truck, to his own profit and to increase the food supply of his city brother. The use of these trucks will save much food which would otherwise go to waste, and it will encourage and stimulate production. The provision of the bill will prove of great value and usefulness and should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I am only going to take a couple of minutes. I have introduced an amendment, and I will ask the Clerk to report it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1 of Senate bill 2718, line 6, after the word "producer," insert the words "in connection with the Parcel Post Delivery System."

Mr. TOWNER. I desire to call the attention of the committee—I have already called the attention of the chairman of the committee—to this amendment, that there is no statement in this first section that connects the provision of the section and the Postal Department at all, and this was only intended for the purpose of showing it was connected with the Parcel Post Delivery System.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman is a good one and ought to be adopted.

Mr. TOWNER. That is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. TOWNER. May not we have a vote on my amendment now to dispose of it?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 9, strike out the words "at the earliest practical date" and insert in lieu thereof the words "not later than December 10, 1918."

Mr. MOON. I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that there is an amendment already pending that has not been disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understood the agreement, all amendments were to be sent up and read; but if it is the other way, the Chair will put them now.

Mr. MOON. I did it under the supposition that the 35 minutes for debate had expired.

The CHAIRMAN. There are five minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is recognized.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment I have offered requires a report from the Postmaster General not later than the 10th of next December rather than "at the earliest practical date." The purpose of that is so that if this proves to be the wonderful success it is predicted here in putting Uncle Sam into the green-vegetable peddling business, it might be taken into consideration in making up the next annual appropriation bill. I assume from the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] that the Postmaster General, who is to have charge of this \$300,000 experiment, might possibly hail from the great State of Texas. For myself I do not believe that this experiment is going to accomplish the great good that has been prophesied for it. Reading the hearings and seeing the answers to the very adroit questions of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], we find that the department is going to keep a record and issue bulletins of the produce and supplies, and prices to producers and consumers and patrons, and to provide for regularity of service, and so forth. And we will find in the purchase of these ton and half-ton trucks, with their \$1,200 drivers, you will build up a great paternalistic system operating from certain favored localities, which will confer benefits upon comparatively few; and in return they are supposed to cart back to the producer some of the products in the city which the farmer needs. In other words, this single employee will become the man to do the ladies' shopping. When he comes back to the city with a load of produce, he will run around to the department stores and hardware stores and to other places to purchase articles and carry them back to the farm.

Mr. STEENERSON. Are these chauffeurs, or employees, to be under the civil service?

Mr. WALSH. The hearings state that they are not; that they could not be in the beginning. The gentleman, my colleague from Massachusetts, stated that the debate on this bill during the past three days has been very sincere. I agree with him. Some of the most sincere debates in this body, I have noticed, are those which engage the attention of the House in taking money out of the Treasury for the benefit of some particular class of Government employees amongst our constituents by way of increasing their compensation or salary. I am rather inclined to agree with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COX] that this is no time for us to be deliberating at length in order to confer authority upon the Postmaster General to experiment and tinker with this motor-truck system, and that this proposed amendment has no place upon this measure which has to do with increasing the salaries and with regarding the post-office employees.

Mr. MOON. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. WALSH. I certainly will.

Mr. MOON. I just rise to say that I think you are mistaken about the gentleman from Indiana making a statement against the bill. He spoke for the bill, I think.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman from Indiana commented upon the fact that we had been three days in debate.

Mr. MOON. And he commented upon the fact that this was a good section.

Mr. WALSH. I understand this particular section has the approval of the gentleman from Indiana, but he commented upon the fact that we had debated three days upon the increase of salaries of these post-office employees. I trust that the amendment to the section will not be agreed to and that this measure may be confined to simply a reasonable salary increase bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. The vote is first on the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON].

Mr. ROBBINS. May we have the amendment read again?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The amendment was again read, as follows:

Amend the first paragraph by inserting after the word "Service," line 12, page 2, of the printed amendment, the following:

"Provided, That the Postmaster General may use the revenue derived from this experimental motor vehicle truck service to establish and maintain additional motor-truck routes and to provide for the purchase of vehicles and operating expenses thereof."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. WALSH. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 87, noes 7.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows.

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 2, line 14, of the printed rule, strike out the words "at the earliest practical date" and insert in lieu thereof the words "not later than December 10, 1918."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 15, noes 77.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending.

Mr. STAFFORD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to inquire whether the vote does not have to be taken by the committee on the proposal offered by the gentleman from Tennessee to adopt it as a part of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will first report the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBBINS] that has been offered.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ROBBINS: Page 2, line 6, after the word "of," strike out "any unexpended" and insert the word "the"; and in line 7 strike out the word "of" and insert in lieu thereof "for."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] to strike out the section.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. WALSH. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 92, noes 6.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. That the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, deliver and turn over to the Postmaster General from time to time, and without charge therefor, for use in the Postal Service, such aeroplanes and automobiles or parts thereof as may prove to be, or as shall become, unsuitable for the purposes of the War Department; and the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to use the same, in his discretion, in the transportation of the mails and to pay the necessary expenses thereof out of the appropriation for inland transportation by steamboat or other power boat or by aeroplanes or star route.

Mr. MADDEN and Mr. NORTON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a question of order.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin rise?

Mr. STAFFORD. To make a point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I maintain that the gentleman is too late. The committee is about dividing.

Mr. STAFFORD. There has been no debate on the proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct about it. The gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the committee, is recognized.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say one word upon this amendment. The language is "the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, deliver disabled aeroplanes used in the war to the Postmaster General, to be used, in his judgment and discretion, for the benefit and carrying on of the war." There is no additional cost, as I understand it, and this service has proved to be a very effective service. While it may not be proper to experiment with the purchase of new machines for the expansion of the service, yet I know of no better use to which the disabled war airplanes can be put than to use them for the Postal Service.

As to the next section, if I may be permitted to refer to it, it fixes 24 cents an ounce as the rate for carrying this sort of mail. The airplane can carry mail five times as fast as a train, and if the rate is fixed as proposed in the bill it is bound to be remunerative.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. DYER. The section provides that the expenses for the upkeep, and so on, shall be charged to the appropriation for inland transportation. Why is that?

Mr. MOON. Because the airplane service would be a branch of inland transportation, and inland transportation for carrying the mail is appropriated for in the Post Office appropriation bill. This bill does not carry a greater appropriation than would be provided for there. It is for an additional service.

Mr. DYER. If any of these automobiles could be obtained, would they be used by the Postmaster General for the extension of the service?

Mr. MOON. Does the gentleman refer to airplanes?

Mr. DYER. No. This includes automobiles as well as airplanes. Would the automobiles be used by the Postmaster General for the extension of the service?

Mr. MOON. I imagine they would be.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman give me five minutes?

Mr. MADDEN. That will give the gentleman five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] moves that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

Mr. ROBBINS. I have an amendment pending.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am heartily in favor of this legislation. The carrying of parcel post and other mail by motor trucks will be a wonderful stimulus to agricultural development in many sections of the country and will in a most material and direct way contribute to the success of the war work of the Nation. I trust that the experiments in the carrying of mail by motor trucks provided for in this bill have been proposed by the Postmaster General with a broad and comprehensive plan in mind for a system of motor-truck mail delivery covering the entire country. I trust that in asking for this legislation at this time from Congress the Postmaster General has done so primarily because its enactment will enable him to put into operation a new system of rural mail collection and delivery which will effectively cooperate and coordinate with the activities of the other departments and branches of the Government to more successfully carry on our part in this war. This legislation has no place here and is entitled to no consideration by the House at this time unless the new system of mail delivery and the experiments it provides for will cooperate and coordinate with and strengthen industries necessary and essential to our successful conduct of the war.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. NORTON. No; I am sorry I do not have the time to do so. I am particularly in favor of that the War Department may turn over to the Post Office Department motor trucks and aeroplanes for which the War Department may have no further use. Aeroplanes, in my judgment, are in the future to play a most prominent part in both the industries of war and the industries of peace. Final victory in the present world war will, in my judgment, be with the side that can place well-manned in the air the greatest number of fighting aeroplanes. It was both surprising and depressing to me to read in the press reports yesterday that Gen. Leonard Wood, who has but recently returned from France, stated to the Senate Committee before which he appeared that, at the time he was in France, while the United States had there more than a thousand trained aviators our Government did not have in France one single fighting aeroplane. I wish to criticize no one at this time. I wish to condemn no one at this time for such a condition. This is no time to criticize or condemn. I want to assist in every way within my power to improve these conditions as rapidly as it is humanly possible to do so. I hope and trust that the condition referred to by Gen. Wood will be very soon changed. I have confidence in the genius and patriotism of my countrymen. I have confidence, that soon, very soon, we shall not only have one, but many thousands of American fighting aeroplanes on the western battle front manned with brave, skillful aviators who will carry the Stars and Stripes to victory against the forces of the mad war lords of Germany and Austria-Hungary and their allies. The one thing of most importance in the world to-day is the one thing of paramount importance to every man, to every woman, and to every child in this land of ours, is the winning of this terrible war in which the very fate of democracy, of free institutions of government, yea of christianity and of modern civilization, is at stake. This war can only be won by us as a united Nation and as a united people dedicated to doing promptly and efficiently whatever will best and most quickly contribute to placing from three to five millions of trained American soldiers, thoroughly well equipped and plentifully supplied with the best munitions and instruments of modern warfare, out on the western battle front in France where the titanic struggle between democracy and military autocracy is being waged.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. NORTON. Not just now.

Mr. DYER. I make the point of order that the gentleman is not talking to the amendment.

Mr. NORTON. Well, what is the gentleman's question? I would be delighted to yield to my good friend from Missouri [laughter] if I only had a little more time. The gentleman knows I only have a few minutes time.

Mr. DYER. I withdraw the point of order. I want to ask the gentleman what is the idea of having automobiles or parts of automobiles in this section? What does the Postmaster General desire to use these automobiles for?

Mr. NORTON. I presume he desires to use these automobiles in carrying out this new system of parcel-post delivery by motor trucks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back one minute of his time.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the committee to what I think is an omission made in this bill. In the report of the Postmaster General he refers to the aeroplanes that he wants to use as the ones that are "not necessary" for use in military operations. In this bill the aeroplanes referred to are described as those that are "not suitable" for military purposes. My amendment simply puts in the words "or unnecessary." We all know that there will be a lot of aeroplanes constructed that will be serviceable for war purposes, but after the war is over they will not be needed or "necessary." Let us make the law correspond with the report and request of the Postmaster General, as found on page 40 of his annual report.

The rural motor service is a most important provision. It is not now altogether experimental. In the Annual Report of the Postmaster General, page 40, he states:

On June 30, 1917, 774 motor routes were in operation. It is desirable that existing restrictions be removed and opportunity provided for establishing service by motor vehicle to rural communities.

I have, Mr. Chairman, one of these routes proposed through my district, extending from Pittsburgh, Pa., via Butler, Pa., to Erie, Pa. I am very much in favor of this amendment and hope this House will adopt it. Further discussion of so meritorious a proposition I deem unnecessary.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to inquire what became of the statement of the Post Office Department which the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee, said he would ask to have read to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WALSH. Why, I submit that it is.

Mr. MOON. I will ask that that statement be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBBINS].

Mr. ROBBINS. Is there any objection to amendment? It is simply to perfect the bill according to the report of the Postmaster General.

Mr. MOON. I do not think there is any serious objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBBINS], which will be read by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 19 of the printed amendment, after the word "unsuitable," insert the words "or unnecessary."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next section of the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. —. That from and after the passage of this act the Postmaster General, in his discretion, may require the payment of postage on mail carried by aeroplane at not exceeding 24 cents per ounce or fraction thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next section of the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. —. That hereafter the balance to the credit of any one person in a postal savings depository, exclusive of accumulated interest, shall not exceed \$3,000. Noninterest-paying deposits shall not be accepted. All laws inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, is an amendment to that amendment in order at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. Does the gentleman from Tennessee desire recognition on his amendment?

Mr. MOON. The amendment offered to the postal-savings act is for the purpose of securing revenue to the Government of the United States. Before the act was amended about a year ago, the amount which would be deposited by any one depositor in the postal savings bank was limited to \$500. At that time we raised the amount to \$1,000 interest-bearing and \$1,000 non-interest-bearing deposits for any one depositor. The result of that has been to double the deposits, to increase them from \$20,000,000 to \$40,000,000. The Post Office Department informs us that there is now an intense demand by people in the country who are not willing to trust the national banks or State banks, but who will trust the postal savings bank, that they be allowed to deposit money in larger amounts. Hundreds of them are ask-

ing the department to be permitted to deposit \$3,000 or \$4,000. The department thinks, as the House thought in the beginning, that it was wise to place a limitation upon the amount which might be deposited by any one depositor, but the department is now of the opinion that the limit ought to be raised. If we have the success in the future which we have had heretofore, there will be a large increase in the revenue of the Government. The amount of the limitation proposed is now \$3,000. The House understands that the Government collects this money from the depositors and pays 2 per cent interest. The Government loans it out under conditions fixed in the statute at 2½ per cent interest. The revenue derived last year from this source above the expense was \$955,000. The department thinks that if you raise the amount of the deposit to \$3,000 for any one depositor there will be a great increase of revenue to the Government.

Mr. DYER. Does the gentleman think this will interfere with the sale of Government bonds or that people will put their money into the postal savings banks instead of buying bonds?

Mr. MOON. Oh, no. The people who deposit in the postal savings bank want to put their money where they can get it out readily, without taking the bonds to the market where they can be sold. In my opinion it will not affect the purchase of Government bonds at all.

While I am on my feet I will say that the next paragraph, with reference to the postal savings law, is simply to provide for a small deposit card and for the purchase of 10 adhesive stamps to be placed upon the card, to be held by the depositors and then presented for collection when desired, without any extra accounting system in the department.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. MADDEN. I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto be closed in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska yield for the purpose of allowing the gentleman to offer this motion?

Mr. LOBECK. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, now I offer my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LOBECK: Page 3 of the printed amendment, line 8, after the word "exceed," strike out the figures "\$3,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$10,000."

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON], the chairman of the Post Office Committee, has made a very good statement which shows that if a small amount was a good thing for the people of the country who want to deposit their money in postal savings banks, a larger amount would be better. I am in favor of increasing the limit up to \$10,000. And, while this section does not cover this point, I think we ought to increase the number of postal savings banks throughout the country. At the present time there are 7,161 postal savings banks scattered throughout the United States. We have 56,170 money-order post offices in the country, and every money-order post office in the country should become a postal savings station. If the present Postal Savings System has brought a revenue of \$900,000 annually, as stated to-day on this floor, to the Government, the extension of the system by the establishment of a larger number of postal-savings stations will still further increase the revenue.

Mr. MADDEN. The experience of the Post Office Department shows that there ought not to be as many postal savings banks as the gentleman indicates, because the deposits in some of them are so small that the cost of auditing amounts to more than the benefit that is derived.

Mr. LOBECK. Right in the city from which the gentleman comes there ought to be more postal savings stations. Throughout that city there are small banks that are accepting deposits from foreign-speaking people, and, I am told, for future shipments to Europe after this war is over. They, these foreign-language people, deposit with banks that speak their own language. They advertise in their papers that they will receive these deposits and will hold them for the depositors. Before the war came on, a million immigrants a year came to this country and several hundred thousand returned each year. They sent \$300,000,000 of money normally every year in savings to Europe, and to-day there are trust companies in the United States which are advertising to hold this money of foreigners, to be returned when the war is over. Uncle Sam ought to get hold of this money now.

Mr. DYER. Why not buy bonds with it instead of passing this section?

Mr. LOBECK. If we have the money, we can use it.

Mr. DYER. We can not use it for buying bonds.

Mr. LOBECK. We ought to pay 3 per cent, instead of 2, to get these deposits. In every mining industry, in every mechanical industry in this country there are large numbers of foreigners who are making good wages, and they should be encouraged to deposit with our Government and should be given ample conveniences to do so.

Mr. DYER. Does not the gentleman think that a lot of these people would put their money in these postal savings banks at 2 per cent, instead of buying bonds, when they can get 4 per cent if we pass this amendment?

Mr. LOBECK. I would rather they would buy bonds; but they would have to be educated to do so. There are trust companies advertising in this country that they are State and city and Government depositories. They are paying 3 per cent. The foreigners that read that language and do not understand English as they ought to deposit their money with these little or large local banks, when they ought to deposit with the Government. We ought to pay them 3 per cent, instead of 2 per cent, and we ought to get 3½ per cent for our money, instead of 2½ per cent, or the Government make use of it. This whole matter ought to be looked into very thoroughly. We ought to collect and would, if we had enough postal savings banks in this country convenient for the laborers and others to make use of same. We could get \$300,000,000 annually, instead of its being held and saved for shipment abroad. Under the privilege to extend my remarks, I had stated that certain banks or trust companies are advertising that they pay 3 per cent, and the following is a translated copy of an advertisement printed in a European language, and which states this offer. This newspaper I am told has a wide circulation:

[From the Népszava, New York, N. Y., Feb. 16, 1918, p. 3.]

Készüljünk A Békére.
Let us prepare for peace.

On February 11 an event of great significance has taken place. The lofty-souled President of the United States delivered an oration rich in ideas of the possibilities of peace. This manifestation of statesmanly wisdom aroused a strong echo all over the world and has carried forward the cause of peace with a great step. Sooner or later this salutary event will have to take place, which will redeem of suffering the peoples bleeding of a thousand wounds.

We do not enter into soothing regarding the time of making peace, but we might say that much, that he acts properly who makes right now the necessary preparations.

As generally known, crowns can not be bought or sold at present, money can not be transmitted to Hungary, and crown deposits can not be placed. But the saved money can very well be sent for deposit to New York, so it shall be at hand at any moment. With the same frankness with which we have till now defended the interests of our clients, we advise them now to place their saved money in their own interest as dollar deposit, bearing interest at 3 per cent, in our mighty bank, where the money—

1. Bears interest from the day of arrival.
2. Is unconditional safety.
3. Is every moment accessible.

We furnish readily more of information and reply to every letter immediately.

TRANSATLANTIC TRUST CO.
67 William Street, New York.

Clients in New York and vicinity may personally apply to our East Side branch, which is open daily during banking hours and on Mondays till 8 p. m.

On February 23, 1918, I had the honor to introduce House bill 10186, which reads as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10186) to amend the act approved June 25, 1910, establishing postal-savings depositories, and acts amendatory thereof, and for other purposes, by extending the usefulness of the Postal Savings System and instituting publicity for securing from the public postal-savings deposits.

Whereas the success of the present war and the prosperity of our Nation after the war depends to a great extent upon our ability to bring into circulation savings which are hoarded and intended for export; and

Whereas it has been so far impossible to establish sufficient numbers of United States postal-savings banks, in spite of the fact that this sort of foreign institutions receive in each normal year hundreds of millions of dollars for safe-keeping from our residents; and

Whereas the rate of interest allowed on deposits by our postal-savings banks and required by them for the redeposit of the same from National and State banks is inadequate and in need of proper adjustment; and

Whereas the export of savings interfere with loyalty and the qualification for citizenship; that savings intended for export form a reserve fund for our imperialistic enemies; that savings kept on deposit in this country promote Americanization and thrift, which being a fundamental requirement of stable government and of welfare of citizens and immigrants, it should be encouraged, aided, and assisted in the necessary and practical manner; and

Whereas the masses of wage earners are in need of specific information for taking cognizance of our postal-savings facilities and to counteract the inducements offered to millions of our residents to export and keep on deposit their savings in foreign countries, which are described as the land of opportunities after the war; and

Whereas it is necessary to provide for postal depositories at each and every one of our post offices, to pay a fair rate of interest for such deposits, and acquaint our population of the availability of these governmental depositories: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act approved June 25, 1910, establishing postal-savings depositories, and acts amendatory thereof, and for other purposes, by extending the usefulness of the Postal Savings System and instituting publicity for securing from the public postal-savings deposits, is hereby amended so that it shall read as follows:

SEC. 3. That said board of trustees is hereby authorized, empowered, and directed to designate all post offices to be postal-savings depository offices, and each and every post office is hereby declared to be a postal-savings depository office within the meaning of this act and is authorized and required to receive deposits of funds from the public and to account for and dispose of the same, according to the provisions of this act and the regulations made in pursuance thereof. Each postal-savings depository office shall be kept open for the transaction of business during such hours as the Postmaster General, with the approval of the board of trustees, shall direct.

SEC. 2. That section 7 of said act is hereby amended so that it shall read as follows:

SEC. 7. That interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum shall be allowed and entered to the credit of each depositor once in each year, the same to be computed on such basis and under such rules and regulations as the board of trustees may prescribe, but interest shall not be computed or allowed on fractions of a dollar.

SEC. 3. That section 9 of said act is hereby amended so that instead of reading: "and the sums deposited shall bear interest at the rate of not less than 2½ per cent per annum," it shall read: "and the sums deposited shall bear interest at the rate of not less than 3½ per cent per annum."

SEC. 4. That section 10 of said act is hereby amended so that instead of reading: "which bonds shall bear interest at the rate of 2½ per cent per annum," it shall read: "which bonds shall bear interest at the rate of 3½ per cent per annum."

SEC. 5. That section 14 of said act is hereby amended so that it shall read as follows:

SEC. 14. That the sum of \$500,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to enable the Postmaster General and the board of trustees to establish the postal-savings depositories in all post offices in accordance with the provisions of this act, including the reimbursement of the Secretary of the Treasury for expenses incident to the preparation, issue, and registration of the bonds authorized in this act; and the Postmaster General is authorized to require postmasters and other postal officers and employees to transact, in connection with their other duties, such postal-savings depository business as may be necessary; and he is also authorized to make, and with the approval of the board of trustees to promulgate, and from time to time modify or revoke, subject to the approval of said board, such rules and regulations not in conflict with law, and compile and disseminate specific information for securing from the public postal-savings deposits, as he may deem necessary to carry the provisions of this act into effect.

SEC. 6. That all laws or parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

This legislation has for its very purpose the increase of larger and increased deposits with the United States postal savings bank, and I hope the House will act favorably on the same and that the bill or some better bill be enacted into law.

I have read with interest an article in the Daily Financial America of date March 6, by Lajos Steiner, which reads as follows:

[From the Daily Financial America, New York, Mar. 6, 1918.]

A DRIVE FOR POSTAL SAVINGS DEPOSITS.

(By Lajos Steiner.)

A campaign should be conducted for securing as postal savings bank deposits those amounts which in normal years are exported from here. For decades before the war over \$300,000,000 have been exported in each normal year by immigrants to their countries of origin. The war made the exportation of this sum impossible for the time being. Immigrants earn higher wages at present than ever before.

The results of such a campaign would improve conditions for more reasons than one. Immigrants would become emancipated from under the yoke of that multitude of concerns which operate at every nook and corner wherever immigrants receive wages, and which concerns solicit and receive for export this sort of savings, sell steamship tickets for remigration, and in the course of plying their trade obstruct the immigrants in becoming Americanized. They keep away the immigrants from our institutions, methods, and ideals so as to be enabled the better to exploit them and to induce them to remigrate. This proceeding is encouraged and facilitated by the agents of the respective European governments, the steamship companies, and their influential and omnipresent votaries.

Foreign-language newspapers derive the largest part of their income from the concerns which advertise for the savings to be exported and the sale of steamship tickets for remigrants. The income of these papers would decrease by the Americanization of immigrants; therefore, they do not promote assimilation, but stimulate the export of savings. These sort of remittances only strengthen the kaisers, and become a total loss to American prosperity.

Systematic work is conducted for having the immigrants stay away from everything American—to have them acquire the habit of exporting their savings; to have them keep their savings on deposit in the postal savings banks of the countries of origin, and in time to purchase tillable land over there. By these influences immigrants were made to believe that they are disliked in this country; that our Government intends to conscript and even to confiscate their savings; that it is impossible for them to reengage in farming successfully in the United States; that after the war Europe will be the land of opportunities; that those who fail to return to Europe immediately after transportation becomes available will be prosecuted and when apprehended court-martialed; that their property will be confiscated and their families dispossessed.

Well-informed men believe that 5,000,000 immigrants will depart from here as soon after peace comes and they can be transported. At present the timid immigrants keep their savings in belts and stockings, they hide it in crevices under the floor, or deposit it for safekeeping with concerns which are to export same when that becomes again possible. Immigrants know that mill and mine will not employ them in old age, and believe that it is best for them to return to Europe after they have accumulated some savings. While everything that can be done is being done for having this proceeding continue, practically nothing is done to effect improvement. This evil should be corrected.

The present time is opportune for remedial action. Corrective work should be commenced without delay. Branches of our postal savings banks should be established and maintained at each and every one of those suburbs, hamlets, railroad shops, mills, mines, and lumber camps where wage earners could avail themselves of these governmental depositories. A campaign should be conducted for soliciting and receiving the deposits of industrial employees. We have some 17,000,000 resident immigrants; all are wage earners, they are diligent, saving, and thrifty. The aggregate of their savings amounts each year to hundreds of millions of dollars. These deposited sums would be redeposited by our postal banks in our national, savings, and other banks, and would augment our national welfare and prosperity. At present these sums are hoarded and really form a reserve fund of enormous amounts for the capitalists. Once immigrants discontinue to export their savings they could be interested in American problems, they would make efforts in time to become United States citizens, and their children would surely be as useful and loyal Americans as the children of the earlier arrivals.

The forces which interdeal in alienating from Americanism our immigrants are at present less efficient than before. Immigrants arrive and depart since the last four years to small extent; therefore they are fitter for Americanization than they have ever been before. The last to arrive is here for about four years and has picked up at least some of our language. Immigrants are now more inclined and qualified to be reached and properly influenced than ever before. At this psychological moment better results could be secured than at any other time. This opportunity should not be neglected. The moral and financial effect of our success would be a disastrous blow to imperialism and a fortunate factor for democracy. The present time is opportune to eliminate the forces which prevent immigrants from becoming Americans.

Let our postal savings banks penetrate those localities where wage earners' savings could be secured for deposit. Branches should be established in out-of-the-way places, at points distant from post offices, in sections reached by rural free delivery, and in those parts of our cities where this sort of people dwell. If necessary, headquarters should be established in offices of employing companies which would be willing to cooperate to the extent of providing such headquarters. Experience proves that immigrants incline quite strongly to make use of postal savings banks. Out of the \$150,000,000 deposited in our postal banks by some 700,000 persons, about 65 per cent are immigrants.

Immigrants trust in governmental institutions. The improvement can be effected, the results could only be beneficial to this country as well as to the depositors. After their savings are kept in this country it will be possible to direct immigrants to our farms and thus increase our food production. Immigrants are land hungry. Just as soon as their savings enable them to do so, they leave industrial employment and reengage in farming. They are good farmers; the lands which they till in Europe are farmed for over 1,000 years and are still productive, because these immigrants know how to till the soil properly and without destroying its fertility. Not only is governmental action called for from the standpoint of humanitarianism, but from the standpoint of our own economic needs of the present and future. The matter involved is a problem no whit less serious than others over which we are concerned because of what the end of the war may mean to us. It is a problem of present as well as future moment, for the agents of foreign governments are utilizing our lack of postal savings facilities to take charge of the funds of resident immigrants to have them sent abroad.

Postal savings bank branches should be established at all those points where wage earners could avail themselves of these governmental depositories, and an aggressive campaign should be conducted to influence the immigrants, by information in the newspapers, by circulars, speeches, and other practical means, to deposit and keep their savings in these Federal banks and make efforts to become good Americans. The present time should be utilized to make a drive for securing postal savings bank deposits.

This subject of increased facilities for the wage earners of this land should be given the most earnest consideration by the Post Office Department as well as Congress at an early date.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out that amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, that motion is not in order. The section has not yet been adopted.

Mr. STAFFORD. The vote is being taken upon its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The rule under which these amendments are being considered says that they shall be considered as sections offered in the bill, and under that construction of the rule which has been heretofore acted upon the Chair thinks the motion of the gentleman from Missouri is in order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri to strike out the section.

The question was taken.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 2, noes 99.

So the amendment to strike out was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. —. That section 6 of the act approved June 25, 1910, is hereby further amended so that the proviso in said section shall read as follows: "Provided, That in order that smaller amounts may be accumulated for deposit, any person may purchase for 10 cents, from any postal-savings depository, specially prepared adhesive stamps to be known as 'postal-savings stamps,' and attach them to a card which shall be furnished for the purpose. A card with 10 postal savings stamps affixed shall be accepted as a deposit of \$1 either in opening an account or in adding to an existing account, or may be redeemed in cash."

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, there is still another section, which I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Sec. —. The additional compensation granted by the provisions of this bill shall be paid out of the revenues of the Post Office Department. If the revenues of the said department shall be insufficient to meet the appropriations made by this act, a sum equal to such deficiency of the revenue of said department is hereby appropriated, to be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply said deficiencies in the revenues for the Post Office Department for the year ending June 30, 1919, and the sum needed may be advanced to the Post Office Department upon requisition of the Postmaster General."

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the section just read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BLACK rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BLACK. I want to discuss the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BLACK. I am going to take only a few moments of the time of the House to discuss some of the financial aspects of this bill as it now stands amended.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman can not make that motion until five minutes is consumed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is correct. The motion is out of order.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, on Friday, after the reading of the first section of the bill, I moved to strike out the reclassification paragraphs of the bill and substitute for it a provision to pay all of the postal clerks, letter carriers, and railway mail clerks 15 per cent per annum increase in compensation where their salaries were \$1,200 or less and 10 per cent per annum increase where their salaries were more than \$1,200 and not in excess of \$1,800. That amendment was not adopted, and in the brief explanation I undertook to make at the time it was offered within the limited time that was then at my disposal I showed from the figures that had been compiled by the Post Office Department that the adoption of my amendment would within the period of four years mean a saving to the Government of at least \$35,000,000.

Now, since I made that motion to amend in the manner that I have just stated other amendments have been placed in the bill which increase still further its annual expenditure \$11,240,000, according to the way I have been able to figure it, and so if this bill is adopted in its present form the first year it will cost about \$40,000,000; the second year it will cost more on account of the automatic promotions; and the third year it will cost still more, and will reach its peak of cost in the fourth year, and will cost the postal revenues at least \$55,000,000 more the fourth year than under present law before the adoption of any salary increases, and therefore when we go into the House from the Committee of the Whole, if I can obtain recognition for that purpose, I will move to recommit the bill with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith, with an amendment striking out all of sections 1 and 2 of the bill and to substitute language which will give all the rural carriers, postal clerks, letter carriers, railway mail clerks, assistant postmasters, and all other postal employees who receive a salary of \$1,200 or less an increase of 15 per cent per annum, which, in the case of a \$1,200 salary, will be \$180 a year, and to those who receive a salary above \$1,200 and not in excess of \$1,800, my amendment would give an increase in salary of 10 per cent per annum. Mr. Chairman, the motion to recommit will not change the effect of the provision in the bill which increases the compensation to fourth-class postmasters, nor will it have any effect on the provision that gives the Postmaster

General the authority to adjust the compensation paid to star-route carriers, screen-wagon services, and so forth.

Mr. MOON. If the gentleman will yield, I want to say to him that the Post Office Department has recommended that we pass an appropriation of \$12,000,000 to meet the expenses up to the beginning of the next fiscal year and \$48,000,000 for the next fiscal year, so the total amount will be \$60,000,000 for this bill.

Mr. BLACK. Yes; I believe that those are the figures which have been compiled by the Post Office Department, but I feel that it is but fair to state that on account of the modification made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] of his amendment here Monday there will be about \$7,200,000 of that amount which has been estimated by the Post Office Department cut off. But notwithstanding this reduction, if the bill goes through as it now stands during the first year undoubtedly it will cost more than \$40,000,000 over present expenditures, and thereafter will cost still more for the second, third, and fourth years, as I have shown.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is upon the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I ask, in pursuance of the unanimous consent heretofore granted, to return to section 6 of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks that the committee return to section 6 under the agreement heretofore made. The Clerk will report the section.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That this act shall be in force and effect from and after its passage. That all laws and parts of laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Mr. MOON. Inasmuch as legally that section means nothing, I move to strike it out.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be instructed to number these sections numerically in their proper order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to number the sections consecutively in their proper order. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOON. And also to amend the title in accordance with the provisions of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. WALSH. I just want to direct the attention of the gentleman from Tennessee to the fact that the title of a bill is not amended in committee.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman is right about that. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and that the bill be reported to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CARAWAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 9414, had directed him to report the same to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Madden amendment and also on the Almon amendment, the first Madden amendment making a permanent increase.

The SPEAKER. What is it the gentleman demands?

Mr. BARKLEY. I demand a separate vote on the Madden amendment making this provision permanent law, the first Madden amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. BARKLEY. I also demand a separate vote on the Almon amendment, increasing the increase to 20 per cent.

The SPEAKER. Is there a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The question was taken, and the other amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky.

The SPEAKER. The vote will be on the first Madden amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman demands the yeas and nays—evidently a sufficient number—

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the amendment be reported.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the word "that" up to and including the word "follows," in line 6, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "hereafter the compensation of postal employees shall be as follows."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman's motion is to strike out the amendment, is it?

The SPEAKER. No; he just simply asks for a vote on the amendment of the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. A vote of "aye" would sustain the amendment?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 264, nays 97, not voting 72, as follows:

YEAS—264.

Anderson	Fairchild, B. L.	La Follette	Rodenberg
Anthony	Fairfield	Langley	Rogers
Ashbrook	Farr	Lea, Cal.	Rose
Austin	Fisher	Leibach	Rowe
Bacharach	Flynn	Leshner	Sabath
Baer	Focht	Linthicum	Sanders, Ind.
Barnhart	Foss	Little	Sanders, N. Y.
Beakes	Francis	Lobeck	Sanford
Beshlin	Frear	London	Saunders, Va.
Bland	Freeman	Longgan	Scott, Iowa
Bowers	French	Longworth	Scott, Mich.
Britten	Fuller, Ill.	Lufkin	Seully
Brodbeck	Fuller, Mass.	Lundeen	Sells
Browne	Gallagher	Lunn	Shallenberger
Browning	Gallivan	McAndrews	Sherwood
Brumbaugh	Gariand	McArthur	Siegel
Burnett	Garrett, Tex.	McCormick	Sinnett
Burroughs	Glynn	McCulloch	Slayden
Butler	Gouwin, N. C.	McFadden	Slemp
Caldwell	Goodwin, Ark.	McKenzie	Sloan
Campbell, Kans.	Graham, Ill.	McKinley	Smith, Idaho
Campbell, Pa.	Gray, N. J.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith, Mich.
Caraway	Green, Iowa	McLaughlin, Pa.	Snell
Carew	Greene, Mass.	McLenore	Snook
Carlin	Greene, Vt.	Madden	Snyder
Carter, Mass.	Gregg	Magee	Steele
Cary	Griest	Maher	Steenson
Chandler, N. Y.	Griffin	Mansfield	Stephens, Nebr.
Chandler, Okla.	Hadley	Mapes	Sterling, Ill.
Clark, Pa.	Hamilton, Mich.	Martin	Sterling, Pa.
Cleary	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mason	Stiness
Coady	Harrison, Va.	Mays	Strong
Cooper, W. Va.	Haskell	Montague	Sullivan
Cooper, Wis.	Haugen	Moore, Pa.	Swift
Costello	Hawley	Moore, Ind.	Switzer
Crago	Hayden	Morgan	Tague
Cramton	Heaton	Morin	Talbot
Crosser	Helvering	Mudd	Taylor, Ark.
Currie, Mich.	Hicks	Neely	Taylor, Colo.
Dale, N. Y.	Hilliard	Nelson	Temple
Dale, Vt.	Hood	Nichols, Mich.	Thompson
Dallinger	Huddleston	Nolan	Tilman
Darlow	Hull, Iowa	Norton	Tilson
Davis	Husted	Oldfield	Timberlake
Delaney	Hutchinson	Oliver, N. Y.	Tinkham
Dempsey	Igoe	Olney	Towner
Denison	Ireland	Osborne	Treadway
Denton	Jacoway	O'Shaunessy	Vare
Dewalt	James	Paige	Vestal
Dill	Johnson, Ky.	Parker, N. J.	Volgt
Dillon	Johnson, Wash.	Parker, N. Y.	Volstead
Donovan	Jones, Tex.	Peters	Waldow
Doolling	Juul	Phelan	Walton
Doremus	Kearns	Platt	Wason
Dowell	Keating	Polk	Watson, Pa.
Dunn	Kelley, Mich.	Porter	Weaver
Dupré	Kelly, Pa.	Purnell	Wheeler
Dyer	Kennedy, Iowa	Raker	White, Me.
Eagan	Kennedy, R. I.	Ramsey	White, Ohio
Eagle	Key, Ohio	Ramseyer	Wilson, Ill.
Edmonds	Kless, Pa.	Randall	Wingo
Edlitt	King	Rankin	Winslow
Elston	Kinkaid	Reavis	Woods, Iowa
Emerson	Knutson	Reed	Woodyard
Esch	Kraus	Riordan	Young, N. Dak.
Evans	Kreider	Robbins	Zihlman

NAYS—97.

Alexander	Brand	Connally, Tex.	Drane
Almon	Buchanan	Connolly, Kans.	Ferris
Aswell	Byrnes, S. C.	Cox	Foster
Ayres	Byrns, Tenn.	Crisp	Garner
Bankhead	Candler, Miss.	Decker	Garrett, Tenn.
Barkley	Cannon	Dickinson	Gillett
Bell	Cantrill	Dixon	Glass
Black	Carter, Okla.	Dominick	Gordon
Blanton	Claypool	Doollittle	Hamlin
Booher	Coiller	Doughton	Hardy

Hastings	Oliver, Ala.	Sears	Walsh
Hedlin	Overstreet	Shackelford	Watkins
Helm	Padgett	Shouse	Watson, Va.
Hensley	Park	Sims	Webb
Holland	Quin	Sisson	Welling
Hull, Tenn.	Ragsdale	Small	Welty
Humphreys	Ralney	Stafford	Whaley
Jones, Va.	Rayburn	Steagall	Wilson, La.
Kincheloe	Robinson	Stedman	Wilson, Tex.
Kitchin	Romjue	Stephens, Miss.	Wise
Larsen	Rouse	Stevenson	Wright
Lazaro	Rubey	Sumners	Young, Tex.
Lever	Rucker	Venable	
McKeown	Russell	Vinson	
Moon	Sanders, La.	Walker	

NOT VOTING—70.

Blackmon	Fordney	Kehoe	Pratt
Borland	Gandy	Kettner	Price
Church	Gard	LaGuardia	Roberts
Clark, Fla.	Good	Lee, Ga.	Rowland
Classon	Goodall	Lenroot	Schall
Cooper, Ohio	Gould	Littlepage	Scott, Pa.
Copley	Graham, Pa.	McClintic	Sherley
Curry, Cal.	Gray, Ala.	Mann	Smith, C. B.
Davidson	Hamill	Meeker	Smith, T. F.
Dent	Harrison, Miss.	Merritt	Sweet
Dies	Hayes	Miller, Minn.	Templeton
Drukker	Helntz	Miller, Wash.	Thomas
Ellsworth	Hersey	Mondell	Van Dyke
Estopinal	Hollingsworth	Mott	Ward
Fairchild, G. W.	Houston	Nicholls, S. C.	Williams
Fess	Howard	Overmyer	Wood, Ind.
Fields	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pou	
Flood	Kahn	Powers	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. GOULD (for Madden amendment) with Mr. BLACKMON (against).

From March 25 to April 15:

Mr. BORLAND with Mr. GOOD.

Until further notice:

Mr. CHURCH with Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. GOODALL.

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH with Mr. HERSEY.

Mr. FIELDS with Mr. MERRITT.

Mr. FLOOD with Mr. MONDELL.

Mr. GRAY of Alabama with Mr. ROWLAND.

Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOWARD with Mr. WOOD of Indiana.

Mr. KETTNER with Mr. SWEET.

Mr. LEE of Georgia with Mr. FORDNEY.

Mr. MCCLINTIC with Mr. MOTT.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina with Mr. MEEKER.

Mr. POU with Mr. WILLIAMS.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. LITTLEPAGE, is unavoidably detained, and he asked me to say that if he were present he would vote "yea" on this vote.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, did Mr. MEEKER vote?

The SPEAKER. No, sir. He is not recorded.

Mr. DYER. Mr. MEEKER is out of the city. He expected to be back to-day to vote. If he were here, he would vote for the Madden amendment.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The vote will be taken on the Almon amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky demands the yeas and nays. All in favor of the yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Forty-eight gentlemen have arisen, not a sufficient number.

Mr. STAFFORD. The other side.

Mr. COX. The other side, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The other side will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Two hundred and sixty-one gentlemen have arisen in the negative. Forty-eight is not a sufficient number. The Clerk will report the amendment that is called for, the Almon amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Almon amendment to the Madden amendment: Strike out "fifteen" and insert "twenty."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Almon amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. COX. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded.

The House divided; and there were—yeas 232, noes 52.

So the Almon amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the title of the bill amended so as to conform with the text.

The SPEAKER. That comes at the last.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BLACK. I am opposed to it as it now stands.

The SPEAKER. If any gentleman is really opposed to the bill and has a motion to recommit, the Chair will recognize him. Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The gentleman says he is opposed to the bill as it now stands.

The SPEAKER. Well, he is able to speak for himself.

Mr. BLACK. I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

The Clerk read as follows:

I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads with instruction to that committee to report the same back forthwith with an amendment striking out all beginning with line 3, page 1, down to and including all of line 11, page 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That during the balance of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the increased allowance for postal employees in addition to the compensation now received by them shall be as follows:

"SECTION 1. That carriers in the Rural Free Delivery Service shall receive 15 per cent per annum up to and including those receiving \$1,200 per annum, exclusive of mileage allowance and \$24 per mile per annum for each additional mile over 24 miles. That clerks in the first and second class post offices and letter carriers in the City Delivery Service shall receive 15 per cent per annum up to and including those receiving \$1,200 per annum and 10 per cent per annum up to and including \$1,800 per annum.

"That railway postal clerks shall receive an increase of 15 per cent per annum up to and including those receiving \$1,200 per annum and 10 per cent per annum from \$1,200 per annum up to and including \$1,800 per annum: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall authorize the Postmaster General to discontinue promotion of clerks in first and second class post offices or carriers in the City Delivery Service or railway postal clerks from grade to grade under the provisions of the classification acts fixing the compensation of those employed in these branches of the Postal Service.

"SEC. 2. That the increases herein provided for shall apply to assistant postmasters in first and second class post offices, allowances for clerks in third-class post offices, and substitute clerks and carriers, also to all post-office clerks, laborers, watchmen, per diem employees, printers, chauffeurs, janitors in post offices, and all other postal employees whose rate of compensation comes within the limit to which these increases apply."

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois demands the yeas and nays.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the demand for the yeas and nays on the previous question or on the motion to recommit?

The SPEAKER. On the motion to recommit, as the Chair understood. Those in favor of taking the vote to recommit by the yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Sixty-one gentlemen have risen.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, one more.

The SPEAKER. Sixty-two.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the Chair has already announced the vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows; but the gentleman wanted to be counted and came in.

Mr. HUDDLESTON rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Alabama rise?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. To make the point of order that the demand for the yeas and nays before action is taken on the previous question is too early.

The SPEAKER. The previous question has been voted.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The Chair did not put the reverse.

The SPEAKER. Oh, yes; he did. There was only one vote against it. Sixty-two gentlemen have risen, not a sufficient number.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. GARNER. I make the point that 62 is a sufficient number.

The SPEAKER. Sixty-two is not.

Mr. COX. The other side!

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and fifty-seven gentlemen have risen. The yeas and nays are refused.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands tellers.

Mr. GARNER. I ask for tellers.

The SPEAKER. You can get tellers if you get enough to vote with you. Those who are in favor of taking this vote by tellers will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Sixty-three gentlemen have risen—a sufficient number—and tellers are ordered. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Black] to act as tellers.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DALLINGER. Is this vote by tellers on the question of whether we shall have a yea-and-nay vote on the motion to recommit?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already announced that.

Mr. DALLINGER. Is it on the motion to recommit? The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Madden] says it is not; that it is on the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The previous question was ordered 15 minutes ago.

The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 70, noes 245.

The SPEAKER. On this vote the ayes are 70 and the noes are 245. Seventy is enough. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MADDEN rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. MADDEN. To make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to have the question stated to the House, so that we can tell.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit. Those in favor of recommitting this bill with the instructions offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Black] will, when their names are called, answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 51, nays 311, not voting 69, as follows:

YEAS—51.

Barkley	Doughton	Howard	Rucker
Black	Ferris	Hull, Tenn.	Sears
Blanton	Fuller, Mass.	Humphreys	Sherley
Boober	Garrett, Tenn.	Kinchelee	Sisson
Buchanan	Garner	Kitchin	Small
Byrnes, Tenn.	Gillett	Lever	Stafford
Candler, Miss.	Glass	Oliver, Ala.	Stragall
Cannon	Gordon	Quin	Stephens, Miss.
Carter, Okla.	Hardy	Ragsdale	Venable
Collier	Heflin	Rainey	Walsh
Connally, Tex.	Helm	Rayburn	Welling
Cox	Hensley	Robinson	Young, Tex.
Dickinson	Holland	Romjue	

NAYS—311.

Alexander	Cramton	French	Kearns
Almon	Crisp	Fuller, Ill.	Keating
Anthony	Crosser	Gallagher	Kelley, Mich.
Ashbrook	Currie, Mich.	Gallivan	Kelly, Pa.
Aswell	Dale, N. Y.	Garland	Kennedy, Iowa
Austin	Dale, Vt.	Garrett, Tex.	Kennedy, R. I.
Ayres	Dallinger	Glynn	Kettner
Bacharach	Darrow	Godwin, N. C.	Key, Ohio.
Baer	Davis	Goodwin, Ark.	Kliss, Pa.
Bankhead	Decker	Graham, Ill.	Kling
Barnhart	Delaney	Gray, Ala.	Kinkaid
Beakes	Dempsey	Gray, N. J.	Knutson
Bell	Denison	Green, Iowa	Kraus
Beshlin	Dewalt	Greene, Mass.	Kreider
Bland	Dill	Greene, Vt.	La Follette
Bowers	Dillon	Gregg	Langley
Brand	Dixon	Griest	Larsen
Britten	Donnick	Griffin	Lazaro
Brodbeck	Donovan	Hadley	Lee, Cal.
Browne	Doolittle	Hamilton, Mich.	Lee, Ga.
Browning	Doremus	Hamilton, N. Y.	Leibach
Brumbaugh	Dowell	Hamlin	Leshner
Burnett	Drame	Harrison, Va.	Linthicum
Burroughs	Dunn	Haskell	Little
Butler	Dupré	Hastings	Lobeck
Byrnes, S. C.	Dyer	Haugen	London
Campbell, Kans.	Eagan	Hawley	Loneragan
Campbell, Pa.	Eagle	Hayden	Lufkin
Cantrill	Edmonds	Heaton	Lundeen
Caraway	Elliott	Helvering	Lunn
Carew	Elston	Hicks	McAndrews
Carlin	Emerson	Hilliard	McArthur
Carter, Mass.	Esch	Hood	McCormick
Cary	Evans	Huddleston	McCulloch
Chandler, Okla.	Fairchild, B. L.	Hull, Iowa	McFadden
Church	Fairfield	Husted	McKenzie
Clark, Fla.	Farr	Hutchinson	McKeown
Clark, Pa.	Fisher	Igoe	McKinley
Claypool	Flynn	Ireland	McLaughlin, Mich.
Cleary	Focht	Jacoway	McLaughlin, Pa.
Coady	Foss	James	McLemore
Connolly, Kans.	Foster	Johnson, Ky.	Madden
Cooper, W. Va.	Francis	Johnson, Wash.	Magee
Cooper, Wis.	Frear	Jones, Tex.	Maher
Costello	Freeman	Jones, Va.	Mansfield
Crago		Juul	Mapes

Martin	Ramsey	Slayden	Towner
Mason	Ramseyer	Slomp	Treadway
Meeker	Randall	Sloan	Vare
Merritt	Rankin	Smith, Idaho	Vestal
Montague	Reavis	Smith, Mich.	Vinson
Moon	Reed	Snell	Voigt
Moore, Pa.	Riordan	Snook	Volstead
Moore, Ind.	Robbins	Snyder	Waldow
Morgan	Rodenberg	Stedman	Walker
Morin	Rogers	Steele	Walton
Mudd	Rose	Steenerson	Wason
Neely	Rouse	Stephens, Nebr.	Watkins
Nelson	Rowe	Sterling, Ill.	Watson, Pa.
Nichols, Mich.	Rubey	Sterling, Pa.	Watson, Va.
Nolan	Russell	Stevenson	Weaver
Norton	Sabath	Stiness	Welty
Oldfield	Sanders, Ind.	Strong	Whaley
Oliver, N. Y.	Sanders, La.	Sullivan	Wheeler
Olney	Sanders, N. Y.	Sumners	White, Me.
Osborne	Sanford	Sweet	White, Ohio
O'Shaunessy	Saunders, Va.	Swift	Wilson, Ill.
Overstreet	Scott, Iowa	Switzer	Wilson, La.
Padgett	Scott, Mich.	Tague	Wilson, Tex.
Paige	Scully	Talbott	Wingo
Parker, N. J.	Sells	Taylor, Ark.	Winslow
Parker, N. Y.	Shackelford	Taylor, Colo.	Wise
Phelan	Shallenberger	Temple	Woods, Iowa
Platt	Sherwood	Thompson	Woodyard
Polk	Shouse	Tillman	Wright
Porter	Siegel	Tilson	Young, N. Dak.
Purnell	Sims	Timberlake	Zihlman
Raker	Sinnott	Tinkham	

NOT VOTING—69.

Anderson	Fields	Kehoe	Pratt
Blackmon	Flood	LaGuardia	Price
Borland	Fordney	Lenroot	Roberts
Caldwell	Gandy	Littlepage	Rowland
Chandler, N. Y.	Gard	Longworth	Schall
Classon	Good	McClintic	Scott, Pa.
Cooper, Ohio	Goodall	Mann	Smith, C. B.
Copley	Gould	Mays	Smith, T. F.
Curry, Cal.	Graham, Pa.	Miller, Minn.	Templeton
Davidson	Hamill	Miller, Wash.	Thomas
Dent	Harrison, Miss.	Mondell	Van Dyke
Denton	Hayes	Mott	Ward
Dies	Helntz	Nicholls, S. C.	Webb
Drukker	Hersey	Overmyer	Williams
Ellsworth	Hollingsworth	Park	Wood, Ind.
Estolina	Houston	Peters	
Fairchild, G. W.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pou	
Fess	Kahn	Powers	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. FIELDS with Mr. TEMPLETON.

Mr. DENTON with Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee with Mr. GOODALL.

Mr. MAYS with Mr. FORDNEY.

Mr. PARK with Mr. PRATT.

Mr. WEBB with Mr. LONGWORTH.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina with Mr. PETERS.

Mr. BLACKMON with Mr. GOULD.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that my colleague, Mr. LITTLEPAGE, is unavoidably absent. I am authorized to say that if he were present he would vote "nay" on this roll call.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce that my colleague, Mr. DAVIDSON, has been called home by the death of a relative. If he were present, he would vote "yea" on the passage of the bill.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 344, nays 9, answered "present" 1, not voting 77, as follows:

YEAS—344.

Alexander	Burroughs	Cooper, Wis.	Doughton
Almon	Butler	Cox	Dowell
Anthony	Byrnes, S. C.	Crago	Drane
Ashbrook	Byrnes, Tenn.	Cramton	Dunn
Austin	Campbell, Kans.	Crisp	Dupré
Ayres	Campbell, Pa.	Crosser	Dyer
Bacharach	Candler, Miss.	Currie, Mich.	Eagan
Baer	Cannon	Dale, N. Y.	Eagle
Bankhead	Cantrill	Dale, Vt.	Edmonds
Barkley	Caraway	Dallinger	Elliott
Barnhart	Carew	Darrow	Elston
Beakes	Carlin	Davis	Emerson
Bell	Carter, Mass.	Decker	Esch
Beshlin	Carter, Okla.	Delaney	Evans
Bland	Cary	Dempsey	Fairchild, B. L.
Blanton	Chandler, Okla.	Denison	Fairfield
Boober	Church	Dewalt	Farr
Bowers	Clark, Fla.	Dickinson	Ferris
Brand	Clark, Pa.	Dill	Fisher
Britten	Claypool	Dillon	Flynn
Brodbeck	Cleary	Dixon	Focht
Browne	Coady	Donnick	Foss
Browning	Collier	Donovan	Foster
Brumbaugh	Connally, Tex.	Dooling	Francis
Burnett	Connolly, Kans.	Doolittle	Frear
	Cooper, W. Va.	Doremus	Freeman

French	Kennedy, Iowa	Oliver, N. Y.	Snell
Fuller, Ill.	Key, Ohio	Olney	Snook
Fuller, Mass.	Kiess, Pa.	Osborne	Snyder
Gallagher	Kincheloe	O'Shaunessy	Stegall
Gallivan	King	Overstreet	Stedman
Garland	Kinkaid	Padgett	Steele
Garrett, Tenn.	Knutson	Paige	Steenerson
Garrett, Tex.	Kraus	Parker, N. J.	Stephens, Miss.
Gillett	Kreider	Parker, N. Y.	Stephens, Nebr.
Glass	La Follette	Phelan	Sterling, Ill.
Glynn	Langley	Platt	Sterling, Pa.
Godwin, N. C.	Larsen	Polk	Stevenson
Goodwin, Ark.	Lazaro	Porter	Stiness
Graham, Ill.	Lee, Cal.	Purnell	Strong
Gray, Ala.	Lee, Ga.	Ragsdale	Sullivan
Gray, N. J.	Leibach	Raker	Sumners
Green, Iowa	Leshner	Ramsey	Sweet
Greene, Mass.	Lever	Ramseyer	Swift
Greene, Vt.	Linthicum	Randall	Switzer
Gregg	Little	Rayburn	Tague
Griest	Lobeck	Reavis	Talbott
Griffin	London	Reed	Taylor, Ark.
Hadley	Loneragan	Riordan	Taylor, Colo.
Hamilton, Mich.	Lufkin	Robbins	Temple
Hamilton, N. Y.	Lundeen	Robinson	Tillman
Hamlin	Lunn	Rodenberg	Tilson
Hardy	McAndrews	Rogers	Timberlake
Harrison, Va.	McArthur	Romjue	Towner
Haskell	McCormick	Rose	Treadway
Hastings	McCulloch	Rouse	Vare
Haugen	McFadden	Rowe	Venable
Hawley	McKenzie	Rubey	Vestal
Hayden	McKeown	Rucker	Vinson
Heaton	McKinley	Russell	Voigt
Heflin	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sabath	Voistead
Helvering	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sanders, Ind.	Waldow
Hensley	McLemore	Sanders, La.	Walker
Hicks	Madden	Sanders, N. Y.	Walton
Hilliard	Magee	Sanford	Wason
Holland	Maher	Saunders, Va.	Watkins
Hood	Mansfield	Scott, Iowa	Watson, Pa.
Howard	Mapes	Scott, Mich.	Watson, Va.
Huddleston	Martin	Scully	Weaver
Hull, Iowa	Mason	Sears	Wellington
Hull, Tenn.	Meeker	Sells	Welty
Husted	Merritt	Shackleford	Whaley
Hutchinson	Montague	Shallenberger	Wheeler
Igoe	Moon	Sherwood	White, Ohio
Ireland	Moore, Pa.	Shouse	Wilson, Ill.
Jacoway	Moore, Ind.	Siegel	Wilson, La.
James	Morgan	Sims	Wilson, Tex.
Johnson, Ky.	Morin	Sinnott	Wingo
Johnson, Wash.	Mudd	Sisson	Winslow
Jones, Tex.	Neely	Slayden	Wise
Jones, Va.	Nelson	Slemp	Woods, Iowa
Juul	Nichols, Mich.	Sloan	Woodward
Kearns	Nolan	Small	Wright
Keating	Norton	Smith, Idaho	Young, N. Dak.
Kelly, Mich.	Oldfield	Smith, Mich.	Young, Tex.
Kelly, Pa.	Oliver, Ala.		Zihman

NAYS—9.

Black	Helm	Quin	Sherley
Garner	Humphreys	Rainey	Stafford
Gordon			

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Walsh

NOT VOTING—77.

Anderson	Fields	Kettner	Price
Aswell	Flood	Kitchin	Roberts
Blackmon	Fordney	LaGuardia	Rowland
Borland	Gandy	Lenroot	Schall
Caldwell	Gard	Littlepage	Scott, Pa.
Chandler, N. Y.	Good	Longworth	Smith, C. B.
Clason	Goodall	McClintic	Smith, T. F.
Cooper, Ohio	Gould	Mann	Templeton
Copley	Graham, Pa.	Mays	Thomas
Costello	Hamill	Miller, Minn.	Thompson
Curry, Cal.	Harrison, Miss.	Miller, Wash.	Tinkham
Davidson	Hayes	Mondell	Van Dyke
Dent	Heintz	Mott	Ward
Denton	Hersey	Nicholls, S. C.	Webb
Dies	Hollingsworth	Overmyer	White, Me.
Drukker	Houston	Park	Williams
Ellsworth	Johnson, S. Dak.	Peters	Wood, Ind.
Estopinal	Kahn	Pou	
Fairchild, G. W.	Kehoe	Powers	
Fess	Kennedy, R. I.	Pratt	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. LONGWORTH (for) with Mr. WALSH (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. ASWELL with Mr. DRUKKER.

Mr. GANDY with Mr. GOODALL.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina with Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

Mr. BLACKMON with Mr. ROWLAND.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. STINESS.

Mr. OVERMYER with Mr. WOOD of Indiana.

Mr. THOMPSON with Mr. ANDERSON.

Mr. WEBB with Mr. HEINTZ.

Mr. MCCLINTIC with Mr. PRATT.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay." I have a pair with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. LONGWORTH, and I desire to withdraw my vote of "nay" and answer "present."

The name of Mr. WALSH was called, and he answered "Present."

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that my colleagues, Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD, Mr. GOULD, Mr. MOTT, Mr. CHANDLER of New York, Mr. WARD, Mr. LA GUARDIA, and Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH are unavoidably absent and desire to have it announced that if they were present they would vote "yea."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. TINKHAM of Massachusetts, and Mr. WHITE of Maine had to leave before this vote was taken and requested me to say that if they were present they would vote "yea."

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. KAHN and Mr. CURRY of California are unavoidably absent and have requested me to state that if they were present they would vote "yea," Mr. CURRY being sick and Mr. KAHN being called away on important business.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that my colleagues, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. FESS, and Mr. COOPER of Ohio are unavoidably absent, and if present would vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make the same announcement with respect to my colleague Mr. FORDNEY. If he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the same announcement with respect to my colleague Mr. POWERS, who if he were present would vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that if Mr. CALDWELL were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island has been unavoidably called away while this vote was pending, and if he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I make the same announcement with respect to my colleague, Mr. LITTLEPAGE. He would vote "yea" if he were present.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. MOON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman to withhold that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman is going to make a request, I would rather not.

Mr. LEVER. I was about to say to the gentleman that I propose to-morrow morning to move to dispense with Calendar Wednesday for to-morrow.

ADJOURNMENT.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes the point of order that there is no quorum present, and evidently there is not. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] moves that the House adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 27, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, submitting an alternative estimate of appropriation for certain employees of the workhouse, District of Columbia, for the fiscal year 1919, in lieu of the original estimate for these positions, found on page 902, Book of Estimates for 1919 (H. Doc. No. 997); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Alien Property Custodian, submitting an estimate of appropriation required by the Alien Property Custodian for salaries and expenses of his office for the fiscal year, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 998); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimate of additional appropriation for quarantine stations, Boston and Cape Charles, United States Public Health Service (H. Doc. No. 999); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate for increases in certain items for the

Public Health Service, over the amounts originally estimated therefor, for 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1000); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. PHELAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10890) to authorize national banking associations to establish branches, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 413), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURNETT, from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10660) to amend an act entitled "An act in reference to the expatriation of citizens and their protection abroad," approved March 2, 1907, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 414), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STEELE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10160) authorizing the several district courts of the United States to appoint official stenographers and prescribing their duties and compensation, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 415), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10153) granting a pension to George Gwynne, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 11046) creating an additional district judge in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 11047) to require the Commissioner of Education to devise methods and promote plans for the elimination of adult illiteracy in the United States; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 11048) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 11049) to amend the first and seventh paragraphs of section 4414 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the act of April 9, 1906; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 11050) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 11051) granting an increase of pension to William Norman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11052) granting an increase of pension to John A. Sare; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11053) granting an increase of pension to Roscoe City; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11054) granting a pension to George A. Eskew; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11055) granting a pension to Nancy Grider; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 11056) granting a pension to J. Forsythe Harrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 11057) granting an increase of pension to Catherine P. Leach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: A bill (H. R. 11058) granting an increase of pension to John W. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 11059) granting a pension to Thomas J. Bland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 11060) granting an increase of pension to George W. Mayo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 11061) for the relief of Orrin F. Strickland; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 11062) granting an increase of pension to Francis C. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEATON: A bill (H. R. 11063) granting an increase of pension to John Brocius; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 11064) to reimburse Susan Sanders for expenditures and expenses incurred in prosecuting the intermarried white cases on behalf of the Cherokee Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. IRELAND: A bill (H. R. 11065) granting a pension to David O. Spencer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 11066) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Michael; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 11067) granting an increase of pension to John S. Wray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 11068) for the relief of Rudolph L. Desdunes; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11069) for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Brennan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 11070) granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Boatman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 11071) granting an increase of pension to William F. Bartlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11072) granting an increase of pension to James T. Chapin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11073) granting an increase of pension to Alphonzo O. Drake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11074) granting an increase of pension to Danford Wyllys; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11075) granting an increase of pension to Rhodes J. Colvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11076) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin P. Branch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11077) granting an increase of pension to John H. Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 11078) granting a pension to Ellen Arbuckle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 11079) granting a pension to Jay H. Lautzenheiser; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 11080) granting an increase of pension to Isaac J. Ledbetter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 11081) granting a pension to Lafayette Martin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VOIGT: A bill (H. R. 11082) for the relief of H. B. Rogers; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REED: A bill (H. R. 11083) granting an increase of pension to James W. Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 11084) for the relief of Andrew Burzynski; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Resolutions of a public meeting at Birdsboro, Pa., and of the men's class, United Presbyterian Church, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, urging an amendment to the Federal Constitution prohibiting polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), resolution of Troop A, Philadelphia Home Defense Reserves, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), resolutions adopted by the United Irish Societies of Chicago, urging that Ireland be made an independent republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of the members of the Beauf Creek Farm Club, urging that higher prices be fixed on farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also (by request), memorial of the St. Louis Furniture Board of Trade, protesting against the passage of House bill 9683; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CAREW: Memorial of the advisory committee of the New York State conference of mayors and other city officials,

relative to patents on the Imhoff tanks; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. CARY: Memorial of the Boise Commercial Club, Boise, Idaho, favoring Senate bill 313; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis., urging tax exemption for bequests, legacies, and gifts to education, philanthropy, and religion; also a resolution of the Woman's Club, Waupaca, Wis., urging the repeal of the second-class postage provisions of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of 24 citizens of South Dakota and resolutions of the Americans' Loyalty League, of Huron, S. Dak., protesting against the zone system for second-class postage rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOOLING: Memorial of advisory committee of the New York State conference of mayors and other city officials, relative to the patents on the Imhoff tank; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FOSS: Petition of the Swedish Evangelical Church of Edgewater, Chicago, Ill., against House bill 5712, for the protection and help of secret societies; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of joint committee of Philadelphia trade bodies favoring retention of the pneumatic-tube postal service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of the Travelers' Protective Association of America; the Paris Literary Club, of Paris, Ky.; the Thursday Literary Club, of St. Albans, W. Va.; the Travelers' Club, of Newark, N. J.; the Woman's Century Club, of Nampa, Idaho; the Civic Club, of Philadelphia; the Seattle Class Journal Publishers' Association, of Seattle, Wash.; the Delta Shakespeare Club, of Lake Village, Ark.; the Somerset Chautauqua Circle, of Somerset, Ky.; the Missouri Federation of Woman's Clubs; the Massachusetts State Federation of Woman's Clubs; the Monday Club, of Webster Groves, Mo.; the Placerville Shakespeare Club, of Placerville, Cal.; the Granite State Dairymen's Association, of New Hampshire; the Woman's Club of Oregon City, Oreg.; the Woman's Club of Albuquerque, N. Mex.; the Lowell Club, of Boone, Iowa; and the Fortnightly Literary Club, of Indianapolis, Ind., asking the repeal of the second-class postage provisions of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of American Defense Society, relative to charter of the German-American Alliance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of C. J. Leinbach, master County Line Grange, No. 1751, of Boone County, Ill., relative to price fixing of farm products and the farm-labor problem; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany House bill 2150, to increase the pension of Joseph A. Craig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: Resolutions of the Farm Labor Committee, State Council of Defense, urging methods for increasing the production of foodstuffs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Petition of R. Everette Finnium, of Denver, Colo., praying for the passage of the Knutson bill, providing for the repeal of that section of the war-revenue act which increases postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Fortnightly Club, of Indianapolis, Ind., protesting against increased postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Frances C. Farnsworth, Mary E. Springsteen, Mrs. Allison Stocker, Martha A. Croxby, Paul Brown, Peter J. Theisen, Mrs. Jesse Onyon, Charlotte V. Harvey, and 111 others, all citizens of the State of Colorado, praying for immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of Dietrich Bros., Baltimore, Md., favoring the establishment of aero mail service from Washington to New York; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Heywood Bros. and Wakefield Co., protesting against the passage of House bill 10591, to limit profits on house-furnishings; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Resolution of the Randle Highlands Citizens' Association, in favor of utilization of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal for shipping purposes; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. OLNEY: Petition of druggists of Massachusetts for the enactment of House bill 5531, establishing a pharmaceutical corps in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions signed by many citizens of Massachusetts favoring House bill 5407; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Memorial of the Irish Women's Council, of Dublin, Ireland, and the principal cities of this country, asking that Ireland be made an independent republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSE: Memorial of Corp. Lucian D. Woodruff, Jr., Camp No. 64, United Spanish War Veterans, of Johnstown, Pa., praying for the passage of House bill 1736, known as the Key bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of T. H. A. Moores, Rev. P. H. Williams, C. W. Cook, Ernest J. Wright, R. T. Schell, Isaac Peck, representing the Johnstown, Pa., branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, praying that the report of the congressional committee which investigated the St. Louis riots be published; to special committee.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of the Livingston County Pomona Grange, N. Y., with 1,470 members, unanimously urging the passage of emergency war prohibition; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petitions for war-emergency prohibition as a military necessity, as follows: Highland United Presbyterian Church, Second United Presbyterian Church, Central Presbyterian Church, Mahoning Methodist Episcopal Church, Primitive Methodist Church, Wesley and Simpson Churches, Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, Free Methodist Church, First Baptist Church, and First Christian Church, all of New Castle, Pa.; also a petition of the same significance from the Woman's Club, Ellwood City, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, March 27, 1918.

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 26, 1918.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m.

PUBLICATION OF CASUALTY LISTS (S. DOC. NO. 208).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WOLCOTT). The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of War in response to a resolution of the 22d instant, giving the reasons of the War Department for withholding places of residence of those whose names appear in the casualty lists. The communication will be printed and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and also ordered printed in the Record.

The communication is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 22, 1918.

TO THE PRESIDENT UNITED STATES SENATE

SIR: I am in receipt of Senate resolution under date of March 22, 1918, requesting me, if not inconsistent with the interest of the service, to inform the Senate if an order has been issued by the War Department to the effect that hereafter in publishing the casualty lists of the American Expeditionary Forces now abroad that the names of soldiers only would be given, withholding the announcement of their residence and next of kin; and if so, the reasons for such an order. I would inform you in reply that an order to that effect has been issued by the War Department.

The method pursued by the War Department with reference to information concerning casualties is the following:

First. To place in the hands of the nearest relative or the friend given by the soldier in his emergency address prompt and accurate information concerning the casualty before anything is given to the press.

Second. To prevent any information appearing in the papers which will be of any possible assistance to the German cause.

The old system, which gave the date of the casualty, enabled the Germans to get exactly what effect was produced upon our troops in a raid of that date. The publication of the address of the nearest relative or the emergency address did not give the relative any information which had not already been given to them, but it brought down upon them a swarm of claim agents, who guaranteed that they would obtain from the Government the war-risk insurance which is guaranteed by law to the proper inheritor, and in spite of the fact that the department has in each case advised the nearest relatives that their claims will be adjusted by the Government and that they will be furnished the money that is due them without the interposition of claim agents, numbers of poor people have yielded to the importunities of these claim agents, and are thereby deprived of a portion of what is justly their due. The department has also been informed by the Red Cross that relatives of men who are killed in France were the victims, under the system of giving their addresses publicly, of the most absurd propositions to make money, making their grief an object of exploitation.

The raids which are being conducted along our front are for the purpose of capturing a soldier, if possible, with the object of obtaining from him information about the organization which is opposed to the German lines at that point. With the publication of the address of the nearest relative, the German agents in the United States approach the relatives and obtain from them the very information which Germany is attempting to obtain along our front by attacks on our forces.

In France they publish no casualty lists at all, and the information reaches the relatives from the mayor of the town where the relatives live, who is required to communicate the facts to them verbally.

The matter of a change in our former method of publishing casualty lists was brought up by a cablegram from Gen. Pershing, in which he stated that representatives of the French Government had formally